

Tuition and Fee Differentiation at Degree Granting Postsecondary Education Institutions

Sean Anthony Simone, Ph.D.

AIR/NCES Postdoctoral Policy Fellowship

May 2010

This report was prepared for the National Center for Education Statistics at the US Department of Education under Contract Number ED-03-CO-0020.



AN AIR/NCES
DATA POLICY
FELLOWSHIP
REPORT

TUITION AND FEE DIFFERENTIATION AT
DEGREE GRANTING POSTSECONDARY
EDUCATION INSTITUTIONS



Sean Simone, Ph.D. | May 2010

The AIR/NCES Policy Fellowship Program

The National Center for Education Statistics (NCES) Postsecondary Studies Division collects and analyzes data on postsecondary education in the United States. As part of fulfilling its charge to “collect, analyze, and report education information and statistics in a manner that...is objective...and... is relevant and useful to practitioners, researchers, policymakers, and the public” (Public Law 107-279 § 151), NCES funded the Policy Fellowship Program through the Association for Institutional Research. Policy fellows plan and conduct a year-long research project designed to result in improvements to the quality, comparability, and usefulness of the Integrated Postsecondary Education Data System (IPEDS).

This report represents the opinions of the author alone and does not represent the views of the Association for Institutional Research, the National Center for Education Statistics, the Institute for Education Sciences, or the U. S. Department of Education.

Table of Contents

Executive Summary	1
Background	3
Research questions	4
The survey	4
Brief methodology	5
Survey respondents	6
Findings	9
Differences in tuition and fee levels by student status	9
Differences in tuition and fee levels by student residency	11
Differences in tuition and fee levels depending on service in armed forces	13
Differences in tuition and fee levels by instructional delivery method	14
Differences in tuition and fee levels by instructional academic program	17
Overall levels of tuition and fee differentiation at degree-granting institutions	24
Limitations	26
Conclusions	27
Appendix A: Brief Literature Review	28
Appendix B: Methodology	30
Sampling design	30
Data collection	35
Missing data analysis and weighting adjustments	36
Appendix C: Survey Questionnaire	42
Appendix D: Communications with Respondents	51
References	57

Tables and Figures

Table 1: Comparison of analytic sample and population of degree-granting postsecondary education institutions: 2008 IPEDS Institutional Characteristics Survey	7
Table 2: Percent of institutions that charge different tuition levels depending on student status by institutional sector: Fall 2008	10
Table 3: Percent of institutions that charge different fee levels depending on student status by institutional sector: Fall 2008	10
Table 4: Percent of institutions that charge different first-time full-time undergraduate tuition levels depending on student residency by institutional sector: Fall 2008.....	12
Table 5: Percent of institutions that charge different first-time full-time undergraduate fee levels depending on student residency by institutional sector: Fall 2008.....	12
Table 6: Percent of institutions that charge different tuition and/or fee levels to full-time undergraduate students due to service in the armed forces: Fall 2008	13
Table 7: Percent of institutions that charge different full-time undergraduate tuition levels based on enrollment in honors or distance education programs: Fall 2008.....	15
Table 8: Percent of institutions that charge different full-time undergraduate fee levels based on enrollment in honors or distance education programs: Fall 2008.....	15
Table 9: Percent of institutions that charge different full-time undergraduate tuition levels based on enrollment in weekend or evening programs: Fall 2008	16
Table 10: Percent of institutions that charge different full-time undergraduate fee levels based on enrollment in weekend or evening programs: Fall 2008	17
Table 11: Percent of institutions that charge different tuition levels to first-time full-time students based on academic program compared with what the institution reports to IPEDS: Fall 2008	18
Table 12: Percent of institutions that charge different fee levels to first-time full-time students based on academic program compared with what the institution reports to IPEDS: Fall 2008	19
Table 13: Percent of academic year reporting institutions that charge different tuition and/or fee levels by academic program to first-time full-time students by type of charge: Fall 2008	19
Table 14: Percent of institutions that charge different tuition and fee levels to first-time full-time students based on academic program by institutional sector (including program reporting institutions): Fall 2008.....	20
Table 15: Percent of academic year reporting institutions that charge different tuition levels to first-time full-time students by number of academic programs impacted and institutional sector: Fall 2008.....	21
Table 16: Percent of academic year reporting institutions that charge different fee levels to first-time full-time students by number of academic programs impacted and institutional sector: Fall 2008	22
Table 17: Most common program areas (by 2-digit CIP code) that are charged at different tuition levels: Fall 2008	23

Table 18: Most common program areas (by 2-digit CIP code) that are charged at different fee levels: Fall 2008.....	23
Table 19: Percent of academic year reporting institutions that charge different tuition and fee levels because of a student's attendance status, level, academic program, and/or instructional delivery method by number of factors used to differentiate tuition and fees: Fall 2008.....	25
Table 20: Percent of institutions reporting first-time full-time student tuition and fee levels to IPEDS by methodology of calculating charges: Fall 2008.....	25
Table B1: Stratified sampling projected design effect statistics in relation to a simple random sample of 862 respondents using log published tuition: 2008.....	32
Table B2: Disproportionate stratified sampling projected design effect statistics in relation to a simple random sample using the variance of log published tuition: 2008.....	33
Table B3: Disproportionate stratified sampling actual design effect statistics in relation to a simple random sample using the variance of log published tuition: 2008.....	34
Table B4: Differential tuition response rates by number of contacts: Fall 2008.....	35
Table B5: Strata weight adjustment calculations due to differential selection probability.....	36
Table B6: Strata weight adjustment calculations due to unit non-response.....	37
Table B7: Final weights by stratum (wt2n).....	37
Table B8: Alternate strata weight adjustment calculations due to differential selection probability with post-stratification correction.....	38
Table B9: Alternate strata weight adjustment calculations due to unit non-response with post- stratification correction.....	39
Table B10: Final weights by stratum with post-stratification correction (wt4n).....	40
Table B11: Comparison of unweighted and weighted samples with population of degree-granting postsecondary education institutions: 2008 IPEDS Institutional Characteristics Survey.....	41
Figure C1: Survey introduction screen.....	42
Figure D1: Sample email #1 to data reporting coordinators.....	51
Figure D2: Sample email #1 to chief executive officers.....	52
Figure D3: Sample email #2 to data reporting coordinators.....	53
Figure D4: Sample email #2 to chief executive officers.....	54
Figure D5: Sample email #3 to data reporting coordinators.....	55
Figure D6: Sample email #3 to chief executive officers.....	56

Executive Summary

This paper presents the results of a survey study to understand the differentiation of tuition and fee charges at postsecondary education institutions. The purpose of this study is to understand the extent to which postsecondary institutions set charges that differ depending on academic program, student status, residency, student service in the armed forces, and instructional delivery method. Specifically, this study seeks to understand how the differentiation of tuition and fee pricing in postsecondary education may impact data reporting to surveys in the Integrated Postsecondary Education Data System (IPEDS)¹ as well as other related survey programs.

A web-based survey was designed and piloted to measure the level of tuition differentiation at degree-granting postsecondary education institutions. The survey was sent to data reporting coordinators at 1,507 institutions. Five hundred institutions responded to the survey yielding a 33% response rate. The findings of the study indicate:

- The number of institutions that charge different tuition and fees depending on a student's academic program is much lower than is indicated in the literature. Nearly 80% of degree-granting postsecondary institutions do not have different tuition levels depending on a student's academic program. Only 13% of institutions charge tuition to students depending on their enrolled program. The remaining institutions are not required to report published tuition and fee data to IPEDS because they do not have undergraduate or first-time full-time students.
- Some institutions charge different tuition and fee levels depending on a student's part-time status. Approximately 39% of institutions charge different levels to students if they are part-time students. Common practices include charging a higher price per credit to part-time students or charging a flat tuition rate above a certain credit level.

¹ IPEDS is a federal data reporting program for postsecondary institutions administered by the National Center for Education Statistics (NCES) in the US Department of Education (see <http://nces.ed.gov/ipeds>). Reporting to IPEDS is required for all postsecondary education institutions receiving Title IV aid from the federal government. The program is a primary source of data for postsecondary education institutions in the United States.

- Nearly 91% of institutions charge a different tuition level if a student is at the graduate level versus undergraduate level. Sixty-six percent (66%) charge a different fee level to graduate students.
- Differential tuition and fee charges based upon undergraduate level (i.e., upper level, lower level, freshman, sophomore, junior, senior) is less common with only 7% of institutions using this practice.
- Nearly 99% of public 4-year institutions and 97% of public 2-year institutions charge different tuition levels based upon a student's residency (i.e., in-district, in-state, out-of-state). One quarter of public 2-year institutions further differentiate tuition by charging an in-district and in-state rate, and the remaining 72% only charge an in-state rate. Private non-profit and for-profit institutions have not adopted the practice of differentiating price by residency.
- Many sectors charged different tuition and fee levels to students in the armed forces. Public institutions were more likely than other sectors to charge lower tuition and fee levels by charging students in the armed forces an in-state or in-district rate. For-profit institutions were more likely than other sectors to charge a lower tuition and fee level.
- The analysis indicates that there are very low levels of differential tuition and/or fees charged for honors, distance education, weekend or evening programs.
- Combining all the factors and characteristics tracked in this study (including academic program, attendance status, student level, and instructional delivery method) nearly 68% of institutions use at least one factor to charge a different tuition level. Nearly one-third of institutions charge different tuition levels based on two or more factors. For fees, nearly 64% of institutions charge different fees for at least one of these factors. Nearly one-quarter use two or more factors.

Despite charging differential tuition and fees based upon a number of factors, the analysis indicates that published tuition and fee information reported to IPEDS and other surveys are accurate for the majority of first-time full-time students in postsecondary education. While not comprehensive, data from surveys such as the IPEDS Institutional Characteristic survey are robust and represent charges to most first-time full-time undergraduate students entering postsecondary institutions.

Background

Many postsecondary education institutions set tuition and fee prices at different levels depending on a number of factors including student status, undergraduate level, student residency, service in the armed forces, instructional delivery method, or academic program. This differentiation of tuition and fees increases difficulty in determining the actual costs students pay to attend postsecondary education institutions. Surveys that collect tuition and fee information for the general public (such as the Integrated Postsecondary Education Data System (IPEDS) collected by the National Center for Education Statistics (NCES)) rely on simple and standardized pricing information so consumers can plan future educational expenses. It is difficult, however, for these surveys to capture the complexity of pricing differentiation charged by postsecondary institutions because different students can be charged different tuition and fee levels. The purpose of this report is to explore the extent to which postsecondary degree-granting institutions charge different tuition and fee levels depending on student characteristics or campus services.

Exploring the level of tuition and fee differentiation is important for two reasons:

- According to Ward and Douglass (2005) the proliferation of differential tuition policies is likely to increase in the short-term as higher education institutions seek to diversify funding. The increase in the use of differential tuition is most likely due to declines in state support (Heller, 2006; Mortenson, 2004), increases in college costs (Winston, 1999a; Zemsky, Wegner, & Massy, 2005), and increased competition between the non-profit and for-profit sectors (Ward & Douglass, 2005; Winston, 1999b).²
- In 2008 Congress passed legislation that renewed the Higher Education Act of 1965 and included additional reporting and disclosure requirements for institutions receiving Title IV federal aid. These requirements are designed to address consumer concerns about the increasing cost of attending postsecondary institutions (specifically colleges and universities). Institutions that differentiate

² For a more detailed review of the literature used to guide this survey study, see Appendix A.

tuition charges depending on student characteristics or campus services make it difficult to provide accurate price information to consumers.

The purpose of this study is to understand the extent to which postsecondary institutions set charges that differ depending on class level, program, major, or other characteristics.

Specifically, this study seeks to understand how differentiation of tuition and fee pricing in postsecondary education may impact data reporting to the Integrated Postsecondary Education Data System and other related survey programs.

Research questions

In response to the problems identified above, this study seeks to answer the following research questions:

1. What percentage of degree granting postsecondary education institutions have differential pricing policies depending on:
 - student status (e.g., part-time/full-time, undergraduate/graduate, lower-level/upper level)
 - student residency (e.g., in-district, in-state, out-of-state),
 - service in the armed forces,
 - instructional delivery method (e.g., honors programs, distance education, nontraditional programs), and
 - instructional academic program?
2. Are there differences in differential pricing practices depending on an institution's sector (i.e., public, 4-year or above; private not-for-profit, 4-year or above; private for-profit, 4-year or above; public, 2-year; private not-for-profit, 2-year; private for-profit, 2-year)?

The survey

To answer the research questions for this study, a survey was created using the available literature on tuition and fee pricing practices. This information was supplemented by interviews with institutional researchers and higher education organization researchers/analysts. To narrow

the focus of the study, most questions only address tuition charged to first-time full-time undergraduate students. While this is only a subset of the undergraduate population, most higher education surveys including those from IPEDS and the College Board collect information for these students. Because of the diversity of academic programs in postsecondary education, questionnaire items only focus on the largest program for select program areas using two-digit classification of instructional program (CIP) codes. Questionnaire items were tested through expert interviews, cognitive interviews, and a pilot study of 19 institutional researchers. The finalized questionnaire contains items covering the following topic areas:

- differences in tuition levels by student status, service in the armed forces, instructional delivery method, and academic program,
- differences in fee levels by student status, service in the armed forces, instructional delivery method, and academic program,
- reporting/calculation methods used when reporting tuition and fee information, and
- the number of programs charged at the same tuition and fee level (program reporter³ institutions only).

When possible, IPEDS definitions were used to define key terms in the survey. IPEDS instructions were also used to calculate full-time tuition for institutions that do not charge a flat semester tuition/fee charge (i.e., institutions that charge by credit/contact hours), institutions on a quarter credit system, or institutions on a nontraditional calendar. IPEDS data were also used to reduce the number of questionnaire items on the survey (e.g., tuition and fees by student residency) and reduce the number of potential respondents that received a survey (IPEDS data was sufficient for answering all survey items for institutions without undergraduate students). A final copy of the survey and list of data definitions are available for review in Appendix C.

Brief methodology

The methodology for this study utilized a stratified sampling design to maximize the efficiency of soliciting responses. The population of degree-granting Title IV institutions in the

³ Program reporting institutions are institutions that report tuition data to IPEDS for the top 6 academic programs. Most degree-granting institutions report tuition rates by academic year (or a presumed flat tuition rate for most academic programs).

IPEDS universe in 2008 was 4,495 institutions. Responses from 524 institutions were required to obtain an adequate sample for statistical analyses. To achieve that goal, 1,504 institutions were contacted with an anticipated response rate of 35%.⁴

The survey for this study was available to respondents in electronic format on a website and included embedded links to define terms and computations. To avoid confusion, skip patterns were embedded into the website code. Most respondents were unaware of skip patterns, reducing the error associated with misinterpreting instructions and the flow of questions. The survey took between 10 to 25 minutes to complete depending on the levels of tuition and fee differentiation at the institution.

Respondents were contacted in the fall of 2009 requesting that they complete a follow-up survey to the IPEDS Institutional Characteristics Survey. The day after the IPEDS Institutional Characteristics survey closed (October 15th), respondents received an email with an embedded link requesting that they complete the survey. Two reminder emails were sent to increase the response rate for the survey. The survey closed after approximately two months. After the survey closed the tuition schedules and course catalogs for 200 institutions were reviewed to ensure the data reported were accurate.⁵

Survey respondents

Of the 4,495 Title IV degree-granting institutions in IPEDS eligible for selection in this study, 1,507 potential respondents were randomly selected within each sector (or stratum) to complete the survey. Of these institutions, 85 did not have undergraduate students in 2008, so these surveys were completed using IPEDS data without contacting the institution. Of the remaining institutions, 1,470 were successfully contacted and 415 institutions responded. Including the 85 institutions previously mentioned, the survey yielded a 33% response rate with an estimated sampling error (or confidence interval) of approximately $\pm 4\%$. As shown in Table 1, there were statistically significant differences between the sample and the population that could lead to biased estimates of the population. Private not-for-profit 4-year institutions were more representative in the sample when compared to the population. Private for-profit 2-year

⁴ See Appendix B for a description of the calculations used to compute the sample for this study.

⁵ See Appendix B for more detailed about the methodology used in this study.

Table 1: Comparison of analytic sample and population of degree-granting postsecondary education institutions: 2008 IPEDS Institutional Characteristics Survey

	Analytic Sample Percent (%) n=500	Population Percent (%) N=4,495
By Control ***		
Public	40.2	37.8
Private/Nonprofit	47.0 ^a	37.2
Private/For profit	12.8 ^b	24.9
By Sector ***		
Public 4-year	18.4	14.9
Private/Nonprofit 4-year	42.4 ^a	35.0
Private/For profit 4-year	10.8	12.0
Public 2-year	21.8	22.9
Private/Nonprofit 2-year	4.6 ^a	2.2
Private/For profit 2-year	2.0 ^b	13.0
Less-than-2-year	0.0	0.0
By Tuition Reporting Method ***		
Academic year	99.0 ^a	94.1
Program	1.0 ^b	5.9
By Carnegie Classification		
Doctoral Research Universities	9.4 ^a	5.8
Masters Colleges & Universities	17.6 ^a	13.3
Baccalaureate Colleges	12.2	11.9
Baccalaureate/Associates Colleges	1.4	1.2
Associates Colleges	28.6	33.2
Other/Specialty Institutions	18.4	14.7
Unclassified	12.4	19.9
Geographic Region		
New England	5.0	5.9
Mid-Atlantic	15.6	15.9
Great Lakes	15.4	15.1
Plains	13.0	10.3
Southeast	23.6	24.6
Southwest	10.2	8.8
Rocky Mountains	2.8	3.7
Far West	12.4	13.6
US Territories	1.8	1.9
Average Published Tuition	\$11,933	\$11,538

NOTES: Adjusted standardized residuals were reviewed to determine the likely cause of a statistically significant hypothesis test. The (a) notation indicates that the statistically significant test was likely a result of a frequency value that is greater than two (2) standard deviations above the expected value. The (b) notation indicates that the statistically significant test was likely a result of a frequency value that is less than two (2) standard deviations above the expected value.

institutions, however, were less represented in the sample when compared to the population. Private not-for-profit 2-year institutions responded at higher rates than were in the population because that sector/stratum was subject to oversampling to ensure adequate representation of the sector. There were also significant differences by Carnegie classification with the larger Doctoral and Masters Universities responding at higher rates. To correct for potential non-response bias and differential sampling probabilities, two weights were computed to allow for a more accurate representation of the population. An analysis of the weighted data and a missing data analysis indicated that using the weighted analytical sample can be generalized to the entire population of institutions.⁶ All tables in the findings section are weighted to adjust for unit non-response and disproportionate sampling probabilities.

⁶ For a more detailed analysis of unit-non response, missing data, and the computation of the weights used in this study, see Appendix B.

Findings

Overall, the findings from this survey indicate that institutions are not charging different tuition levels as much as some authors (Nelson, 2008; Ward and Douglass, 2005) suggest. While many postsecondary education institutions do charge different tuition levels based on student status and student residency, fewer institutions charge based upon academic program (to full-time first-time students⁷) or by instructional delivery method. This section presents the findings to this study.

Differences in tuition and fee levels by student status

The first section of this report seeks to learn whether or not institutions charge different tuition and fee levels depending on a student's status as a full-time student (as opposed to a part-time student) or an undergraduate student (as opposed to a graduate student). As shown in Table 2, institutions widely practice charging different tuition levels based upon some of these characteristics. Approximately 39% of institutions charge different tuition levels to students if they enroll part-time. Common practices include charging a higher price per credit to part-time students or charging a flat tuition rate above a certain credit level. Nearly 91% of institutions charge a different tuition level to students in a graduate program versus in an undergraduate program. It is less common for institutions to charge different levels to students based upon undergraduate level (i.e., upper level, lower level, freshman, sophomore, junior, senior) with only 7% of institutions utilizing this practice. As shown in Table 3, fees follow a similar pattern but at slightly lower levels with 30% charging a different fee level because of full-time status, 66% because of graduate student status, and 2% as a result of undergraduate level.⁸

⁷ IPEDS defines a first time students as a "...student who has no prior postsecondary experience (except as noted below) attending any institution for the first time at the undergraduate level. This includes students enrolled in academic or occupational programs. It also includes students enrolled in the fall term who attended college for the first time in the prior summer term, and students who entered with advanced standing (college credits earned before graduation from high school)." See <http://nces.ed.gov/ipeds/glossary/?charindex=F> for more detail.

⁸ Public institutions in some states are not permitted to charge tuition to in-state students as a result of legislative action (California being the most prominent example). Other states do not allow increases in tuition levels. Institutions in states with either of these policies generate revenues through fee charges instead of tuition. Nelson (2008) classified fees at these institutions as de facto tuition. This study requested information for tuition and fees separately and did not reclassify fees into tuition.

Table 2: Percent of institutions that charge different tuition levels depending on student status by institutional sector: Fall 2008

Institutions with different tuition levels charged to students based upon:			
	Part-time status***	Undergraduate level***	Graduate status***
	Percent (%)	Percent (%)	Percent (%)
	n=426	n=426	n=193
Public, 4-year	60.0	7.1	90.7
Private not-for-profit, 4-year	63.2	2.6	87.8
Private for-profit, 4-year	8.5	12.5	100.0
Public 2-year	24.6	1.7	--
Private not-for-profit, 2-year	45.5	9.1	--
Private for-profit, 2-year	20.0	20.0	--
All sectors	39.2	7.0	90.8

Asterisks(*) indicate statistically significant differences (* p < 0.05; ** p < 0.01; *** p < 0.001) when comparing the sectors.

NOTES: All data presented in this table are weighted to adjust for unit non-response and differential sampling probabilities. The number of respondents for some questions is reduced because not all questions apply to these institutions.

SOURCE: AIR/NCES Postdoctoral Policy Fellowship Differential Tuition Survey administered between October and December 2009.

Table 3: Percent of institutions that charge different fee levels depending on student status by institutional sector: Fall 2008

Institutions with different fee levels charged to students based upon:			
	Part-time status***	Undergraduate level	Graduate status***
	Percent (%)	Percent (%)	Percent (%)
	n=403	n=403	n=182
Public, 4-year	54.4	3.0	48.4
Private not-for-profit, 4-year	55.0	3.7	77.0
Private for-profit, 4-year	4.4	0.0	91.7
Public 2-year	22.5	0.0	--
Private not-for-profit, 2-year	20.0	0.0	--
Private for-profit, 2-year	0.0	0.0	--
All sectors	30.4	1.7	66.3

Asterisks(*) indicate statistically significant differences (* p < 0.05; ** p < 0.01; *** p < 0.001) when comparing the sectors.

NOTES: All data presented in this table are weighted to adjust for unit non-response and differential sampling probabilities. The number of respondents for some questions is reduced because not all questions apply to these institutions.

SOURCE: AIR/NCES Postdoctoral Policy Fellowship Differential Tuition Survey administered between October and December 2009.

An analysis of tuition and fee levels indicates that there are differences in the percentage of institutions charging different tuition levels by student status depending on the institution's sector. Over 60% of public 4-year and private, not-for-profit 4-year institutions charge different levels to part-time students while only 9% of private for-profit 4-year institutions do. For tuition charges depending on undergraduate/graduate status, 100% of private for-profit, 4-year institutions and 90% of other 4-year institutions charged different levels. There was less variation of tuition levels depending on undergraduate level (i.e., upper level, lower level, freshman, sophomore, junior, senior) with less than 20% of institutions within each sector charging different tuition by undergraduate level. Fee charges followed a similar pattern except for charges by undergraduate level in which there were no statistically significant differences in differential fee levels by sector.

Differences in tuition and fee levels by student residency

In the early 1970's, most public colleges and universities adopted policies that differentiated tuition by a student's residency (Carbone & Jenson, 1971). An analysis of IPEDS data indicates that the practice has remained unchanged for public colleges and universities. As shown in Tables 4 and 5, public institutions charge different tuition levels depending on a student's residency (i.e., in-state or in-district). Nearly 99% of public 4-year institutions and 97% of public 2-year institutions charge different tuition levels based upon residency. One quarter of public 2-year institutions further differentiate tuition by charging an in-district and in-state rate, and the remaining 72% only charge an in-state rate. Private non-profit and for-profit institutions have not adopted the practice of differentiating price by residency.

Table 4: Percent of institutions that charge different first-time full-time undergraduate tuition levels depending on student residency by institutional sector: Fall 2008

	Institutions with different tuition levels charged to students who live (n=400): ***	
	In-district and In-state	In-state only
	Percent (%)	Percent (%)
Public, 4-year	0.0	98.5
Private not-for-profit, 4-year	0.0	0.0
Private for-profit, 4-year	0.0	0.0
Public 2-year	24.8	71.7
Private not-for-profit, 2-year	0.0	0.0
Private for-profit, 2-year	0.0	0.0
All sectors	7.1	36.7

Asterisks(*) indicate statistically significant differences (***) $p < 0.001$ when comparing the sectors.

NOTES: All data presented in this table are weighted to adjust for unit non-response and differential sampling probabilities. The number of respondents for some questions is reduced because not all questions apply to these institutions.

SOURCE: U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics, Integrated Postsecondary Education Data System (IPEDS), Fall 2008, Institutional Characteristics component. Analysis by author.

Table 5: Percent of institutions that charge different first-time full-time undergraduate fee levels depending on student residency by institutional sector: Fall 2008

	Institutions with different fee levels charged to students who live (n=400): ***	
	In-district and In-state	In-state only
	Percent (%)	Percent (%)
Public, 4-year	0.0	16.7
Private not-for-profit, 4-year	0.0	0.0
Private for-profit, 4-year	0.0	0.0
Public 2-year	2.6	10.5
Private not-for-profit, 2-year	0.0	0.0
Private for-profit, 2-year	0.0	0.0
All sectors	0.8	5.7

Asterisks(*) indicate statistically significant differences (***) $p < 0.001$ when comparing the sectors.

NOTES: All data presented in this table are weighted to adjust for unit non-response and differential sampling probabilities. The number of respondents for some questions is reduced because not all questions apply to these institutions.

SOURCE: U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics, Integrated Postsecondary Education Data System (IPEDS), Fall 2008, Institutional Characteristics component. Analysis by author.

Differences in tuition and fee levels depending on service in armed forces

With the recent focus on postsecondary education to students who serve in the armed forces, a set of questions was included in the survey to determine if institutions set tuition and fee levels dependent on a student's service. As shown in Table 6, approximately 12% of institutions charge students who currently or previously served in the armed forces a lower tuition level and 18% of institutions classify these students as in-state for billing purposes. The majority of institutions (approximately 70%) charge these students at the same level. For fees, 5% charge a lower fee level and 17% of institutions classify students as in-state.

An analysis of the data indicates that there are differences by sector in the way institutions charge tuition levels to students that have served in the armed forces. For both tuition and fees public institutions were more likely to charge tuition and fees at the in-state rate to students in the armed forces; for-profit institutions were more likely to charge a lower level of tuition and fees; and private not-for-profit institutions were most likely to charge the same rate.

Table 6: Percent of institutions that charge different tuition and/or fee levels to full-time undergraduate students due to service in the armed forces: Fall 2008

	Institution tuition levels based upon a student's service in the armed services:					
	Tuition*** (n=425)			Fees *** (n=372)		
	Students Classified as instate	Lower level than most programs	Same level as most programs	Students Classified as instate	Lower level than most programs	Same level as most programs
Public, 4-year	54.3	4.3	41.4	44.1	2.9	51.5
Private not-for-profit, 4-year	1.7	2.6	95.7	1.9	0.0	98.1
Private for-profit, 4-year	6.4	25.5	68.1	7.3	17.1	75.6
Public 2-year	30.4	10.4	59.1	26.0	1.9	72.1
Private not-for-profit, 2-year	0.0	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
Private for-profit, 2-year	0.0	29.7	70.3	0.0	13.3	86.7
All sectors	18.4	11.7	69.8	16.9	4.5	78.4

Asterisks(*) indicate statistically significant differences (* p < 0.05; ** p < 0.01; *** p < 0.001) when comparing the sectors.

NOTES: All data presented in this table are weighted to adjust for unit non-response and differential sampling probabilities.

SOURCE: AIR/NCES Postdoctoral Policy Fellowship Differential Tuition Survey administered between October and December 2009.

It should be noted, however, that private nonprofit institutions could be providing benefits to students in the armed forces through financial aid, which is beyond the scope of this report.

Differences in tuition and fee levels by instructional delivery method

Another factor that postsecondary education institutions use to differentiate tuition and fee charges is by the type of instructional delivery. This study defines instructional delivery two ways:

- type or method of instruction, including honors programs and programs where the majority of courses are delivered through distance education methods⁹ and
- time of instruction such as evening, weekend, or week day.

Tables 7 and 8 display the percentage of institutions that charge different tuition and fee levels by type/method of instruction. The tables indicate that there are very low levels of differential tuition and/or fees charged for honors or distance education programs. Only 0.4% charge a different tuition level to students in an honors program, and 7% charge different tuition levels if a student is enrolled in a distance education program. For fees, 11% of institutions charge different fee levels to students in distance education programs with the majority of those institutions charging higher fees.

Because of the number of empty cells, determining any differences in the number of institutions that differentiate tuition and fees by honors/distance education by sector using statistical tests was not feasible. Most institutions either charged the same level for these programs (53% for honors and 56% for distance education tuition) or the question was not applicable (47% for honors and 37% for distance education tuition). If there are differences by sector, the overall rates indicate that these differences would be small.

A second set of questions presented to respondents asked if the institution charged different tuition levels for weekend or evening programs. Again, as seen in Tables 9 and 10,

⁹ This study adapted IPEDS definitions for distance education. Distance learning is defined as an "...option for earning course credit at off-campus locations via cable television, internet, satellite classes, videotapes, correspondence courses, or other means" (definition is identical to IPEDS). The survey further clarified that a distance learning program is a program defined by an institution that predominately contains courses that are delivered through distance learning. Institutions were asked to exclude from the analysis individual distance learning courses.

Table 7: Percent of institutions that charge different full-time undergraduate tuition levels based on enrollment in honors or distance education programs: Fall 2008

	Institutions tuition levels based upon enrollment in:							
	Honors programs (n=500)				Distance education programs (n=500)			
	% with higher tuition	% at the same level	% with lower tuition	% not applicable	% with higher tuition	% at the same level	% with lower tuition	% not applicable
Public, 4-year	1.3	81.3	1.3	16.0	13.5	62.2	4.1	20.3
Private not-for-profit, 4-year	0.0	54.0	0.0	45.9	2.3	30.5	8.0	59.2
Private for-profit, 4-year	0.0	28.3	0.0	71.7	0.0	86.7	0.0	13.3
Public 2-year	0.0	59.6	0.0	40.4	2.6	86.1	0.0	11.3
Private not-for-profit, 2-year	0.0	27.3	0.0	72.7	0.0	20.0	0.0	80.0
Private for-profit, 2-year	0.0	29.7	0.0	70.3	0.0	40.0	0.0	60.0
All sectors	0.2	52.6	0.2	47.0	3.4	55.8	3.4	37.3

Asterisks(*) indicate statistically significant differences (* p < 0.05; ** p < 0.01; *** p < 0.001) when comparing the sectors.

NOTES: All data presented in this table are weighted to adjust for unit non-response, differential sampling probabilities, and a post-stratification adjustment (the post-stratification adjustment was required to account for the inflated response rate of institutions without undergraduates - data from these institutions were derived using IPEDS data).

SOURCE: AIR/NCES Postdoctoral Policy Fellowship Differential Tuition Survey administered between October and December 2009 and the U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics, Integrated Postsecondary Education Data System (IPEDS), Fall 2008, Institutional Characteristics component. Analysis by author.

Table 8: Percent of institutions that charge different full-time undergraduate fee levels based on enrollment in honors or distance education programs: Fall 2008

	Institutions fee levels based upon enrollment in:							
	Honors programs (n=500)				Distance education programs (n=500)			
	% with higher tuition	% at the same level	% with lower tuition	% not applicable	% with higher tuition	% at the same level	% with lower tuition	% not applicable
Public, 4-year	1.3	81.3	1.3	16.0	16.0	56.0	6.7	21.4
Private not-for-profit, 4-year	0.0	50.3	0.0	49.8	4.0	27.6	4.6	63.8
Private for-profit, 4-year	0.0	28.3	0.0	71.7	5.0	83.3	0.0	11.7
Public 2-year	0.0	58.8	0.0	41.2	10.4	75.7	0.9	13.0
Private not-for-profit, 2-year	0.0	27.3	0.0	72.7	0.0	27.3	0.0	72.7
Private for-profit, 2-year	0.0	29.7	0.0	70.3	9.4	29.7	0.0	60.9
All sectors	0.2	51.1	0.2	48.5	8.0	49.9	2.8	33.1

Asterisks(*) indicate statistically significant differences (* p < 0.05; ** p < 0.01; *** p < 0.001) when comparing the sectors.

NOTES: All data presented in this table are weighted to adjust for unit non-response, differential sampling probabilities, and a post-stratification adjustment (the post-stratification adjustment was required to account for the inflated response rate of institutions without undergraduates - data from these institutions were derived using IPEDS data).

SOURCE: AIR/NCES Postdoctoral Policy Fellowship Differential Tuition Survey administered between October and December 2009 and the U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics, Integrated Postsecondary Education Data System (IPEDS), Fall 2008, Institutional Characteristics component. Analysis by author.

very few institutions charge a different level of tuition. Only 4% of institutions charge different rates for weekend programs, and the majority of institutions that do charge a different level charge a lower rate. Nearly 8% of institutions charge a different tuition level for evening programs with 7% of institutions charging a lower rate. The fee levels depending on evening or weekend programs follow similar patterns.

Because of the low number of institutions that charge different tuition levels based upon enrollment in evening or weekend programs, it is difficult to state with statistical certainty that any differences by sector exist. Over 90% of institutions either charge tuition at the same level or found that the question was not applicable to the institution (e.g. no weekend/evening programs, does not charge fees, no full-time undergraduates). Overall, institutions are unlikely to charge different rates by instructional delivery method (honors, distance education, weekend, or evening programs), regardless of sector.

Table 9: Percent of institutions that charge different full-time undergraduate tuition levels based on enrollment in weekend or evening programs: Fall 2008

	Institutions tuition levels based upon enrollment in:							
	Weekend programs (n=500)				Evening programs (n=500)			
	% with higher tuition	% at the same level	% with lower tuition	% not applicable	% with higher tuition	% at the same level	% with lower tuition	% not applicable
Public, 4-year	2.7	44.0	0.0	53.4	3.9	51.3	1.3	43.4
Private not-for-profit, 4-year	0.6	19.0	9.2	71.2	1.1	26.4	15.5	56.9
Private for-profit, 4-year	0.0	31.7	0.0	68.3	0.0	83.3	0.0	16.7
Public 2-year	0.0	67.8	0.0	32.2	0.0	77.2	0.0	22.8
Private not-for-profit, 2-year	0.0	18.2	0.0	81.8	0.0	36.4	0.0	63.6
Private for-profit, 2-year	0.0	20.0	0.0	80.0	0.0	60.9	9.4	29.7
All sectors	0.6	35.6	3.4	60.6	1.0	53.3	6.8	38.9

NOTES: All data presented in this table are weighted to adjust for unit non-response, differential sampling probabilities, and a post-stratification adjustment (the post-stratification adjustment was required to account for the inflated response rate of institutions without undergraduates - data from these institutions were derived using IPEDS data).

SOURCE: AIR/NCES Postdoctoral Policy Fellowship Differential Tuition Survey administered between October and December 2009 and the U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics, Integrated Postsecondary Education Data System (IPEDS), Fall 2008, Institutional Characteristics component. Analysis by author.

Table 10: Percent of institutions that charge different full-time undergraduate fee levels based on enrollment in weekend or evening programs: Fall 2008

	Institutions tuition levels based upon enrollment in:							
	Weekend programs (n=500)				Evening programs (n=500)			
	% with higher tuition	% at the same level	% with lower tuition	% not applicable	% with higher tuition	% at the same level	% with lower tuition	% not applicable
Public, 4-year	1.3	45.3	0.0	53.4	1.3	53.3	1.3	44.0
Private not-for-profit, 4-year	0.6	19.7	5.8	74.0	1.1	28.0	9.1	61.8
Private for-profit, 4-year	0.0	31.7	0.0	68.3	0.0	83.3	0.0	16.7
Public 2-year	0.0	66.1	0.0	33.9	0.0	73.7	0.9	25.4
Private not-for-profit, 2-year	0.0	18.2	0.0	81.8	0.0	36.4	0.0	63.6
Private for-profit, 2-year	0.0	20.0	0.0	80.0	0.0	70.3	0.0	29.7
All sectors	0.4	35.7	2.0	61.9	0.6	54.5	3.6	41.3

NOTES: All data presented in this table are weighted to adjust for unit non-response, differential sampling probabilities, and a post-stratification adjustment (the post-stratification adjustment was required to account for the inflated response rate of institutions without undergraduates - data from these institutions were derived using IPEDS data).

SOURCE: AIR/NCES Postdoctoral Policy Fellowship Differential Tuition Survey administered between October and December 2009 and the U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics, Integrated Postsecondary Education Data System (IPEDS), Fall 2008, Institutional Characteristics component. Analysis by author.

Differences in tuition and fee levels by instructional academic program

Another factor institutions use to differentiate tuition and fee levels is the academic program students are enrolled. Questionnaire items on the survey asked if institutions charged first-time full-time students different tuition levels by program, and if so, to provide the program area using 2-digit CIP (classification of instructional program) codes. In reviewing the literature, Nelson (2008) asserted that 44% of public research institutions charge different tuition levels depending on a student's major. As shown in Table 11, the number of institutions that charge tuition by program is much lower at 7%. Nearly 80% of degree-granting postsecondary institutions do not have different tuition levels depending on a student's program. If program reporting institutions are included, the percentage of institutions that charge by program is 13%.¹⁰ Approximately 8% of institutions in this survey reported that they do not report tuition

¹⁰ In this survey study, almost 9% of public 4-year institutions charge different tuition levels to students depending on their academic program. The discrepancy between Nelson's (2008) higher percentage is most likely due to the narrower focus of this study. The survey only requested tuition and fee data for first-time full-time students. Broadening the scope of the study would have likely yielded a higher percentage of institutions charging different tuition levels by program. Many nursing programs, for example, charge a higher rate for the clinical phase of the program than to students who are in their first or second year.

Table 11: Percent of institutions that charge different tuition levels to first-time full-time students based on academic program compared with what the institution reports to IPEDS: Fall 2008

	Percent (%) (n=500)
Academic Year Reporting Institutions	
All programs are charged at the same level	79.5
Some programs are charged at a different level	6.9
Program reporting (top 6 programs)	6.1
Does not report	
No undergraduate students	6.2
No first-time full-time students	1.3

NOTES: All data presented in this table are weighted to adjust for unit non-response, differential sampling probabilities, and a post-stratification adjustment (the post-stratification adjustment was required to account for the inflated response rate of institutions without undergraduates - data from these institutions were derived using IPEDS data).

SOURCES: AIR/NCES Postdoctoral Policy Fellowship Differential Tuition Survey administered between October and December 2009 and the U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics, Integrated Postsecondary Education Data System (IPEDS), Fall 2008, Institutional Characteristics component. Analysis by author.

data because they either had no undergraduate students or no first-time undergraduates.

The percentage of institutions charging different mandatory fees by program is slightly higher than tuition. As shown in Table 12, 70% of institutions charge fees at a flat level to all programs. Approximately 9% do charge different fees depending on a student's program (12% when including program reporting institutions). Nearly 11% of institutions report that they do not charge mandatory fees.

Table 13 provides an accurate overall percentage of institutions that charge tuition and fees by academic program to first-time full-time students. When combining tuition and fees, 84% of institutions do not charge tuition or fees depending on a student's academic program. The remaining 16% charge differential tuition, fees, or both tuition and fees by program to first-time full-time students. Consistent with the previous tables, most institutions that differentiate tuition by program do so through mandatory fees (8% of institutions) rather than tuition (6% of institutions). Only 2% charge both tuition and fees by program.

Table 12: Percent of institutions that charge different fee levels to first-time full-time students based on academic program compared with what the institution reports to IPEDS: Fall 2008

	Percent (%) (n=500)
Academic year reporting institutions	
All programs are charged at the same level	69.8
Some programs are charged at a different level	8.5
Institution does not charge fees	8.1
Program reporting institutions	
Reports top 6 programs	3.3
Institution does not charge fees	2.8
Does not report	
No undergraduate students	6.2
No first-time full-time students	1.3

NOTES: All data presented in this table are weighted to adjust for unit non-response, differential sampling probabilities, and a post-stratification adjustment (the post-stratification adjustment was required to account for the inflated response rate of institutions without undergraduates - data from these institutions were derived using IPEDS data).

SOURCES: AIR/NCES Postdoctoral Policy Fellowship Differential Tuition Survey administered between October and December 2009 and the U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics, Integrated Postsecondary Education Data System (IPEDS), Fall 2008, Institutional Characteristics component. Analysis by author.

Table 13: Percent of academic year reporting institutions that charge different tuition and/or fee levels by academic program to first-time full-time students by type of charge: Fall 2008

	Percent (%) (n=390)
All programs at the institution charged tuition and fees at the same level	84.1
Institution charges different price levels for EITHER tuition OR fees for some programs	16.0
Institution charges TUITION at a different level for some programs, but not fees	6.0
Institution charges FEES at a different level for some programs, but not tuition	8.2
Institution charges different TUTION OR FEES at a different level for some programs	1.8

NOTES: All data presented in this table are weighted to adjust for unit non-response and differential sampling probabilities.

SOURCE: AIR/NCES Postdoctoral Policy Fellowship Differential Tuition Survey administered between October and December 2009.

There are statistically significant differences by sector in the percentage of institutions that charge students depending on academic program. When combining program reporting institutions with academic year institutions that charge by program, private for-profit two year institutions have the highest percentage of institutions that charge tuition (50%) and fees (30%) by program. As shown in Table 14, all other sectors have a statistically comparable percentage of institutions that charge by program (with percentages near the mean percent of 13% for tuition and 12% for fees). When institutions that report tuition by program to IPEDS are excluded from the analysis, there are no significant differences by sector of institutions that charge tuition and fees by program. In other words, even though some academic year reporting institutions charge tuition by academic program, the percentage of institutions charging by program is statistically the same by sector.

Table 14: Percent of institutions that charge different tuition and fee levels to first-time full-time students based on academic program by institutional sector (including program reporting institutions): Fall 2008

Institutions with different price levels due to academic program (n=500):		
	Tuition *** Percent (%)	Fees *** Percent (%)
Public, 4-year	4.1	10.5
Private not-for-profit, 4-year	9.7	9.1
Private for-profit, 4-year	13.3	6.7
Public 2-year	3.5	10.5
Private not-for-profit, 2-year	0.0	9.1
Private for-profit, 2-year	50.0	29.7
All sectors	12.8	12.0

Asterisks(*) indicate statistically significant differences (* p < 0.05; ** p < 0.01; *** p < 0.001) when comparing the sectors.

NOTES: All data presented in this table are weighted to adjust for unit non-response, differential sampling probabilities, and a post-stratification adjustment (the post-stratification adjustment was required to account for the inflated response rate of institutions without undergraduates - data from these institutions were derived using IPEDS data).

SOURCES: AIR/NCES Postdoctoral Policy Fellowship Differential Tuition Survey administered between October and December 2009 and the U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics, Integrated Postsecondary Education Data System (IPEDS), Fall 2008, Institutional Characteristics component. Analysis by author.

While some academic year reporting institutions may charge different tuition and fee levels depending on program, the number of program areas (using 2-digit CIP codes) is low. As shown in Table 15, approximately 5% of all academic year reporting institutions charge one to three academic program areas at a different tuition level and less than 1% charge four or more programs at a different tuition level. Table 16 displays similar figures for fees where approximately 10% of academic year reporting institutions charge different fee levels for one to three program areas and 1.2% charge different fee levels to four or more program areas. There are no statistically significant differences by sector in the level of tuition or fee differentiation by program (excluding institutions that report tuition to IPEDS by program).

Table 15: Percent of academic year reporting institutions that charge different tuition levels to first-time full-time students by number of academic programs impacted and institutional sector: Fall 2008

	Number of program areas (2-digit CIP codes) with at least one program that charge a different tuition level than is reported to IPEDS (n=390):		
	None Percent (%)	One to three Percent (%)	Four or more Percent (%)
Public, 4-year	94.0	4.5	1.5
Private not-for-profit, 4-year	89.6	10.4	0.0
Private for-profit, 4-year	91.1	6.7	2.2
Public 2-year	97.4	1.8	0.9
Private not-for-profit, 2-year	100.0	0.0	0.0
Private for-profit, 2-year	100.0	0.0	0.0
All sectors	94.7	5.2	0.8

Asterisks(*) indicate statistically significant differences (* p < 0.05; ** p < 0.01; *** p < 0.001) when comparing the sectors.

NOTES: All data presented in this table are weighted to adjust for unit non-response and differential sampling probabilities.

SOURCE: AIR/NCES Postdoctoral Policy Fellowship Differential Tuition Survey administered between October and December 2009.

Table 16: Percent of academic year reporting institutions that charge different fee levels to first-time full-time students by number of academic programs impacted and institutional sector: Fall 2008

	Number of program areas (2-digit CIP codes) with at least one program that charge a different fee level than is reported to IPEDS (n=346):		
	None Percent (%)	One to three Percent (%)	Four or more Percent (%)
Public, 4-year	87.5	6.3	6.3
Private not-for-profit, 4-year	88.5	11.5	0.0
Private for-profit, 4-year	97.4	2.6	0.0
Public 2-year	88.6	11.5	0.0
Private not-for-profit, 2-year	100.0	0.0	0.0
Private for-profit, 2-year	76.0	24.0	0.0
All sectors	88.7	10.1	1.2

Asterisks(*) indicate statistically significant differences (* p < 0.05; ** p < 0.01; *** p < 0.001) when comparing the sectors.

NOTES: All data presented in this table are weighted to adjust for unit non-response and differential sampling probabilities.

SOURCE: AIR/NCES Postdoctoral Policy Fellowship Differential Tuition Survey administered between October and December 2009.

The program areas most likely to have tuition or fee charges by program are displayed in Tables 17 and 18. Health professions (CIP code 51) had the highest rank of programs that charge different tuition levels with approximately 4% of academic year reporting institutions. Business programs (CIP code 52) ranked second. Other programs included in the list include Computer Science (CIP code 11), Education (CIP code 13), Agriculture (CIP code 01), Architecture (CIP code 04), Liberal Arts (CIP code 24), and Homeland Security/Law Enforcement (CIP code 43), albeit at very low levels. The top programs at academic year reporting institutions that charged different fee rates include Legal Professions (CIP code 22) with 8% of institutions charging different levels, Health Professions (CIP code 51) with nearly 7% of institutions, and Engineering (CIP code 14) with 3% of institutions. Other program areas include Business (CIP code 52), Education (CIP code 13), Computer Science (CIP code 11), and seven others all with percentages below 2%. The questionnaire items did not divide differential tuition and fee charges by the degree level within these academic programs. Therefore, levels of

Table 17: Most common program areas (by 2-digit CIP code) that are charged at different tuition levels: Fall 2008

Rank	Program Area (via Classification of Instructional Programs (CIP))	2-digit CIP	Institutions that have this program area (CIP) and charge different tuition level
			Percent (%)
1	Health Professions and Related Programs (n=372)	51	4.2
2	Business, Management, Marketing, and Related Support Services (n=387)	52	2.5
3	Computer and Information Sciences and Support Services (n=379)	11	< 2.0
4	Education (n=359)	13	< 2.0
5	Engineering (n=316)	14	< 2.0
Other program areas listed by at least one institution:			
	Agriculture, Agriculture Operations, and Related Sciences	01	
	Architecture and Related Services	04	
	Liberal Arts and Sciences, General Studies, and Humanities	24	
	Homeland Security, Law Enforcement, Firefighting, and Related Protective Services	43	

NOTES: All data presented in this table are weighted to adjust for unit non-response and differential sampling probabilities.
SOURCE: AIR/NCES Postdoctoral Policy Fellowship Differential Tuition Survey administered between October and December 2009.

Table 18: Most common program areas (by 2-digit CIP code) that are charged at different fee levels: Fall 2008

Rank	Program Area (via Classification of Instructional Programs (CIP))	2-digit CIP	Institutions that have this program area (CIP) and charge different fee level
			Percent (%)
1	Legal Professions and Studies (n=100)	22	8.0
2	Health Professions and Related Programs (n=336)	51	6.7
3	Engineering (n=285)	14	2.6
4	Business, Management, Marketing, and Related Support Services (n=346)	51	<2.0
5	Education (n=320)	13	<2.0
6	Computer and Information Sciences and Support Services (n=344)	11	<2.0
Other program areas listed by at least one institution:			
	Agriculture, Agriculture Operations, and Related Sciences	01	
	Personal and Culinary Services	12	
	Engineering Technologies/Technicians	15	
	Biological and Biomedical Sciences	26	
	Psychology	42	
	Public Administration and Social Service Professions	44	
	Visual and Performing Arts	50	

NOTES: All data presented in this table are weighted to adjust for unit non-response and differential sampling probabilities.
SOURCE: AIR/NCES Postdoctoral Policy Fellowship Differential Tuition Survey administered between October and December 2009.

tuition and fee differentiation by program could be at the certificate, associate, or bachelor's degree level.¹¹

Overall levels of tuition and fee differentiation at degree-granting postsecondary institutions

While the differences in tuition and fee levels by program may be relatively lower than predicted in the literature, combining all types of tuition and fee differentiation yields a higher percentage of institutions that charge differential tuition. Combining all the factors tracked in this study including attendance status, student level, academic program, and instructional delivery method¹², nearly 68% of institutions use at least one factor to charge a different tuition level. Nearly one-third of institutions charge different tuition levels based on two or more factors. For fees, nearly 64% of institutions charge different fees for at least one of these factors. Nearly one-quarter use two or more factors. Table 19 displays the percentage of institutions that charge different tuition and fee levels by the number of factors included in this study. It should be noted that a high percentage of 4-year institutions charge different levels of tuition to graduate students when compared with undergraduate students accounting for at least one factor displayed in Table 19.

To understand better the tuition and fee data reported to IPEDS given that some institutions charge different levels of tuition and fees to first-time full-time undergraduate students based on a variety of factors, the survey questionnaire included one question to determine how institutions compute academic year published tuition and fee charges. The IPEDS Institutional Characteristics survey requests published tuition and fee charges for first-time full-time undergraduate students and average tuition levels for all full-time undergraduates. The survey question is designed to understand how accurate the tuition and fee charges are for the majority of first-time full time students. As shown in Table 20, the data reported to IPEDS appear to be accurate for most entering students. Nearly 67% of institutions report the published

¹¹ Caution should be used when interpreting this data for programs at the Bachelor's degree level. Much differentiation occurs for specialized programs below the bachelor's level. The legal professions CIP code, for example, includes a paralegal certificate which some institutions charge at higher rates. For nursing programs in the health professions CIP code, it is rare for first-time students at the Associates or Bachelor's level to be charged a differential rate until the student reaches the clinical stage after two years. Price differentiation for nursing typically occurs at the LPN level. Due to the length of the survey, further specificity was untenable.

¹² Tuition charges by a student's service in the armed service was excluded from this part of the analysis.

Table 19: Percent of academic year reporting institutions that charge different tuition and fee levels because of a student's attendance status, level, academic program, and/or instructional delivery method by number of factors used to differentiate tuition and fees: Fall 2008

	Institutions that charge different tuition or fee levels depending on the factors tracked in the survey:	
	Tuition (n=390) Percent (%)	Fees (n=346) Percent (%)
All students charged at same level	32.4	35.8
Different tuition level based on:		
One factor	37.5	39.5
Two factors	18.1	16.5
Three factors	8.3	5.7
Four or more factors	3.8	2.5

NOTES: All data presented in this table are weighted to adjust for unit non-response and differential sampling probabilities. The factors used to differentiate tuition and fee levels include: attendance status (full time versus part time), level (undergraduate versus graduate and lower level undergraduate versus upper level undergraduate), academic program area (with each 2-digit CIP code counted as a factor), and instructional delivery method (honor versus non-honors program, distance versus classroom, weekend versus weekday, and evening versus day).

SOURCE: AIR/NCES Postdoctoral Policy Fellowship Differential Tuition Survey administered between October and December 2009.

Table 20: Percent of institutions reporting first-time full-time student tuition and fee levels to IPEDS by methodology of calculating charges: Fall 2008

	Percent (%) (n=500)
Academic year reporting institutions	
The published tuition rate applicable to most students	67.3
The highest published tuition rate	5.2
The lowest published tuition rate	2.7
The unweighted average published tuition rate	7.9
The weighted average published tuition rate	2.4
Program reporting institution	
Reports top 6 programs	6.1
Does not report	
No undergraduate students	6.2
No first-time full-time students	1.3

NOTES: All data presented in this table are weighted to adjust for unit non-response, differential sampling probabilities, and a post-stratification adjustment (the post-stratification adjustment was required to account for the inflated response rate of institutions without undergraduates - data from these institutions were derived using IPEDS data).

SOURCES: AIR/NCES Postdoctoral Policy Fellowship Differential Tuition Survey administered between October and December 2009 and the U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics, Integrated Postsecondary Education Data System (IPEDS), Fall 2008, Institutional Characteristics component. Analysis by author.

tuition rate applicable to the majority of students. Approximately 10% report an average tuition rate and 9% report either the highest or lowest published tuition rate.

Limitations

There are a number of limitations to this study. Due to the complexity of tuition and fee pricing at postsecondary education institutions, it is difficult to obtain detailed tuition and fee data in a relatively short and voluntary survey. To maximize response rates, the following compromises were made which limit some interpretations from this study:

- Most of the questions in this survey focus on tuition and fees to first-time full-time students. Narrowing the focus of the study produced accurate estimates of the population but it may not be reflective of differential tuition practices to all undergraduate students. A review of tuition schedules revealed that many institutions charge different tuition and fee levels by academic program to upper level returning students, especially in science or technical fields. This limitation may also explain the discrepancy between the level of tuition and fee differentiation in this report and Nelson's (2008) study who reported much higher rates for public research institutions.
- In the section of the survey that focuses on tuition and fee levels by academic program area using 2-digit CIP code, there was not enough space in the survey to request more detailed information at the major level (6-digit CIP code). Some program areas contain hundreds of programs or majors, and it is not possible to delineate specifically which academic program was charged a higher tuition or fee level. The survey only requested tuition and fee levels for the largest program within the 2-digit CIP code.
- The survey also did not delineate the degree level of academic program (certificate, associate, or bachelors) when requesting student charge information. Levels of differentiation may be higher because institutions may charge different tuition and fee levels to first-time students in technical certificate or associate's programs.
- Because of the small number respondents in the private, for-profit 2-year sector, interpretation of data that sector should be used with caution, but estimates across sectors should be accurate.

Conclusions

Overall, the findings from this survey indicate that institutions are not charging different tuition levels as much as some authors (Nelson, 2008; Ward & Douglass, 2005) suggest. Differentiation of tuition and fees is most likely to occur based upon the following factors or characteristics:

- full-time/part-time student status,
- undergraduate/graduate student status,
- student residency (public institutions only), and
- service in the armed forces (depending on sector).

Institutions are less likely to charge different tuition and fee rates based upon these factors or institutional characteristics:

- undergraduate level (freshman, sophomore, junior, senior),
- instructional delivery (honors and distance education programs),
- weekend or evening programs, and
- academic instructional program.

For most factors or characteristics covered in this study, there are differences in the percentage of institutions that charge differential tuition and fees depending on an institution's sector. There are no differences by sector in the percentage of academic year reporting institutions that charge differential tuition and fees by academic program.

Despite charging differential tuition and fees based upon a number of factors, the analysis indicates that the data reported to tuition and fees surveys are accurate for the majority of first-time full-time students in postsecondary education. While not comprehensive, data from surveys such as the IPEDS Institutional Characteristics survey are robust and represent charges to most first-time full-time undergraduate students entering postsecondary institutions.

Appendix A: Brief Literature Review

The literature on higher education costs or tuition does not focus on differential tuition pricing. The majority of studies focus on tuition/financial aid in the higher education market (e.g. Epple, Romano, & Sieg, 2006; Hoxby, 1997) or factors that increase costs (e.g. Archibald & Feldman, 2008; Massy & Zemsky, 1994; Massy & Zemsky, 1997; Winston, 1999a). The literature on differential tuition practices, however, is sparse. Most studies are from the 1970's and are not from peer reviewed journals. The literature is disproportionately focused on public research universities with little emphasis on private not-for-profit higher education institutions. In addition, little literature is available on for-profit higher education institutions or non-degree granting postsecondary institutions. These earlier studies demonstrated that differential charges by in-state student status was widespread in the early 1970's (Carbone & Jenson, 1971) and a quarter of public institutions charge tuition by student level—undergraduate versus graduate (Saupe & Stephens, 1974). This section describes several more contemporary articles that provide information on differential tuition which are used to guide this proposed study.

In a conceptual article, Yanikowski and Wilson (1984) used economic perspectives to describe why institutions institute differential tuition prices. Yanikowski and Wilson (1984) describe higher education institutions as multi-firms with independent autonomous departments and subunits. They argue that differential tuition is instituted at institutions because it is more equitable than traditional methods—students in less expensive programs are not subsidizing students in more expensive programs. Many institutions, however, choose not to institute differential tuition policies because they are confusing to the consumer and it is difficult to understand the impact of implementation on finances and enrollment. Yanikowski and Wilson (1984) identified different classes of differential tuition which include charges by: student level (upper level/lower level), institutional level (i.e. two-year versus four-year college or university), student level and program (e.g. lower level medical/upper level dental hygiene, etc.), student load, program, and status (e.g. evening versus day programs, part-time versus full time, etc), student demand, and course level.

In another conceptual article, Ward and Douglass (2005) posit that one should expect an increase in the use of differential tuition pricing practices in the short-term at public colleges and

universities because of decreases in state support. Ward and Douglass (2005) suggest that differential tuition pricing was not as prominent in the past because the perceived private benefits of some programs and salary differentials were perceived to be low. Additionally, standardized tuition rates allow for an undergraduate student's ability and interests to guide the choice of major without financial consequences. Recently, however, increased private benefits (in terms of future salary), higher costs of maintaining programs, and the opportunity to collect more revenues have made differential tuition a viable option (Ward & Douglass, 2005). Ward and Douglass (2005) note that at the graduate level, the implementation of differential tuition policies have not affected demand because of the perceived earning power in certain fields following graduation. As a result, Ward and Douglass (2005) argue that differential pricing policies are expected to increase in the next decade.

In a dissertation study, Nelson (2008) used mixed methods that address the lack of information for tuition pricing practices at public universities. In a survey of 101 public research universities, Nelson (2008) found that 44% of respondents charged differential tuition based on program major. In addition to charging different rates by major, some institutions charge differential fees. Twenty-seven percent of institutions charged supplemental fees by major or program. Between 2003 and 2008 nearly 25% of institutions implemented differential tuition pricing while 26% contemplated, but did not implement differential tuition. The most prevalent majors with differential tuition include business, engineering, architecture, education, fine arts, health, and computer science.

Although much of the literature focuses on differential tuition policies at public higher education institutions, little literature addresses other types of postsecondary institutions. This study seeks to understand pricing practices among all the sectors of postsecondary institutions.

Appendix B: Methodology

The research questions for this study seek to understand the extent to which degree-granting postsecondary education institutions are adopting differential tuition policies. Because some scholars (Carbone & Jenson, 1971; Nelson, 2008; Yanikoski & Wilson, 1984) conducted preliminary studies on this topic, enough information is available to develop a survey instrument (see Appendix C). This appendix provides a brief description of the methodology used for this study including procedures used to identify a sample, data collection methods, weighting procedures, and limitations.

Sampling design

The population for this proposed study includes 4,495 degree granting Title IV postsecondary institutions. The sample size for this proposed study was estimated by comparing a simple random sample research design to a stratified random sample research design. First, the sample size for a simple random sample was determined. The formula used to calculate the sample size for a simple random sample is as follows:

$$n' = \frac{z^2 \times p \times (1-p)}{c^2} \quad n = \frac{n'}{1 + \left(\frac{n'}{N}\right)}$$

For this proposed study, a 3% sampling error ($c = .03$) and a 95% confidence level ($z = 1.96$) are used to estimate the desired characteristics of the sample. The probability is set to a conservative 0.5 (p). The estimated sample size required for a simple random sample is 862:

$$n' = \frac{(1.96)^2 \times 0.5 \times (1-0.5)}{.03^2} = 1,067.11 \quad n = \frac{1,067.11}{1 + \left(\frac{1,067.11}{4,495}\right)} \approx 862$$

With an anticipated 35% response rate, it would require contacting 2,463 institutional representatives under a simple random sample design.

In order to reduce the sample size required to conduct this study, the following equation is used to calculate the design effects for the sample if it was stratified. The design effect is the

estimated sample variance in a stratified sample divided by the estimated sample variance of a simple random sample (Groves et al., 2004):

$$d^2 = \frac{v(\bar{y}_{st})}{v_{srs}(\bar{y})} = \frac{\sum_{h=1}^H W_h^2 \left(\frac{1-f_h}{n_h} \right) s_h^2}{\left(\frac{1-f}{n} \right) s^2}$$

The first step in determining the sample size was to calculate the design effect of a stratified random sample for 862 institutions (the amount required in a simple random sample study). As shown in Table B1, under a stratified sampling design (with stratification on institutional sector), the sampling error is reduced increasing the precision of estimates relating to the population. According to the calculations displayed in Table B1, a sample of 862 respondents under a stratified design will yield an estimated 26.2% decrease in standard error using published tuition price as the variable of interest.

Reducing the number of potential respondents in a stratified sampling design can yield the same precision as a sample random sample. As shown in Table B2, reducing the sample size to 524 respondents under a stratified sampling design will yield the same precision as a simple random sample of 862 respondents. With an anticipated response rate of 35%, approximately 1,504 intuitions are required (in this study 1,507 institutions were contacted). In order to obtain more precise estimates from the smallest strata (private not-for-profit 2-year institutions), all institutions in that sample were included. A random sample was selected using a random number generator for degree-granting title IV institutions in each stratum. Institutions with data in IPEDS that could be used to respond to survey questions were removed from the sample to be appended to the main data file following collection.

As shown in Table B3, the actual data collection did not yield as many respondents as anticipated. Five-hundred institutions are represented in the sample with slightly lower precision than a simple random sample of 862 (with standard errors projected at 6% higher than a simple random sample). Only 8 more respondents to the for-profit, 2-year stratum would have provided the same precision as a study utilizing a non-stratified simple random sample. Despite the slightly lower sample, enough respondents provided data to the survey to provide statistical

Table B1: Stratified sampling projected design effect statistics in relation to a simple random sample of 862 respondents using log published tuition: 2008

Stratum	Population Size	Proportion of Population	Stratum Sample Size	Sample (35% Resp Rate)	Stratum Sampling Fraction	Sample Stratum Mean	Sample Stratum Element Variance	Est. Variance of Variable	Est. Var of Simple Random Sample
	N_h	W_h	n_h		f_h	$y_h\text{-bar}$	S^2_h	$v(y_{st}\text{-bar}) = \sum v_h$	$v_{srs}(y\text{-bar})$
Public, 4-year	670	0.15	128	365	0.19	4.1107	0.0401	0.0000056	
Private, not-for-profit, 4-year	1,575	0.35	302	864	0.19	4.2395	0.0628	0.0000207	
For-Profit, 4-year	538	0.12	103	295	0.19	4.1601	0.0200	0.0000022	
Public, 2-year	1,031	0.23	198	566	0.19	3.7323	0.0518	0.0000112	
Private, not-for-profit, 2-year	98	0.02	19	54	0.19	3.9934	0.0643	0.0000013	
For-Profit, 2-year	583	0.13	112	320	0.19	4.0986	0.0192	0.0000023	
Total	4,495		862	2463	0.19	4.0471	0.0849	0.0000433	0.0000796
Design Effect:								0.544	
Estimated Decrease in Standard Error:								26.2%	

Table B2: Disproportionate stratified sampling projected design effect statistics in relation to a simple random sample using the variance of log published tuition: 2008

Stratum	Population Size	Proportion of Population	Stratum Sample Size	Sample (35% Resp Rate)	Stratum Sampling Fraction	Sample Stratum Mean	Sample Stratum Element Variance	Est. Variance of Variable	Est. Var of Simple Random Sample
	N_h	W_h	n_h		f_h	$y_h\text{-bar}$	S^2_h	$v(y_{st}\text{-bar}) = \sum v_h$	$v_{srs}(y\text{-bar})$
Public, 4-year	670	0.15	74	213	0.11	4.1107	0.0401	0.0000105	
Private, not-for-profit, 4-year	1,575	0.35	176	504	0.11	4.2395	0.0628	0.0000389	
For-Profit, 4-year	538	0.12	60	172	0.11	4.1601	0.0200	0.0000042	
Public, 2-year	1,031	0.23	115	330	0.11	3.7323	0.0518	0.0000210	
Private, not-for-profit, 2-year	98	0.02	35	98	0.36	3.9934	0.0643	0.0000006	
For-Profit, 2-year	583	0.13	65	187	0.11	4.0986	0.0192	0.0000044	
Total	4,495		524	1504	0.12	4.0471	0.0849	0.0000796	0.0000796
Design Effect:								1.001	
Estimated Decrease in Standard Error:								0.0%	

Table B3: Disproportionate stratified sampling actual design effect statistics in relation to a simple random sample using the variance of log published tuition: 2008

Stratum	Population Size	Proportion of Population	Respondents by Stratum	Sample Size	Stratum Sampling Fraction	Sample Stratum Mean	Sample Stratum Element Variance	Est. Variance of Variable	Est. Var of Simple Random Sample
	N_h	W_h	n_h		f_h	$y_{h\text{-bar}}$	S^2_h	$v(y_{st\text{-bar}}) = \sum v_h$	$v_{srs}(y\text{-bar})$
Public, 4-year	670	0.15	92	213	0.14	3.6769	0.03134	0.0000064	
Private, not-for-profit, 4-year	1,575	0.35	212	504	0.13	4.2912	0.06053	0.0000304	
For-Profit, 4-year	538	0.12	54	172	0.10	4.1258	0.01560	0.0000037	
Public, 2-year	1,031	0.23	109	330	0.11	3.3269	0.06152	0.0000266	
Private, not-for-profit, 2-year	98	0.02	23	98	0.23	4.0477	0.05806	0.0000009	
For-Profit, 2-year	583	0.13	10	187	0.02	4.0497	0.01287	0.0000213	
Total	4,495		500	1504	0.11	3.8831	0.18777	0.0000894	0.0000796
Design Effect:								1.124	
Estimated Decrease in Standard Error:								-6.0%	

information for most research questions with a sampling error of $\pm 4\%$ (instead of the $\pm 3\%$ projected). The interpretation of estimates for the for-profit, 2-year institution stratum should be interpreted with caution because only 10 institutions represent the sector.

Data collection

Contact information for this study came from the Higher Education Directory from Higher Education Publications, Inc.¹³ The directory lists institutional representatives by job category. Institutions with an Institutional Research Director (or Registrar if the institution does not have an IR director) received a set of three emails requesting assistance with a tuition and fee study. Institutions without an obvious data reporting coordinator received emails directed to the chief executive officer. The first communication occurred on October 15th (the day after IPEDS fall collection closed) with a deadline to respond by November 20th. Institutions that did not respond by November 13th were sent a reminder email. A third communication was sent following Thanksgiving with an extension deadline of December 18th. As shown in Table B4, there was a high rate of good contact information (97.5%) and a response rate of 33.2%. A

Table B4: Differential tuition response rates by number of contacts: Fall 2008

	Count	Percent (%) (n=500)
Responded to survey		
First wave (email #1)	99	6.6
Second wave (email #2)	234	15.5
Third wave (email #3)	82	5.4
IPEDS generated survey	85	5.6
Did not respond to survey		
Successfully contacted (3 emails)	970	64.4
Opted out of communications	5	0.3
Bad email address/contact information	32	2.1
Total possible respondents	1507	

¹³ The directory can be located at the following URL: <http://www.hepinc.com>.

copy of all communications sent to potential respondents can be reviewed in Appendix D.

Missing data analysis and weighting adjustments

Multiple priori analyses were required to ensure that the findings in this study will be generalizable to all title IV degree-granting postsecondary institutions. An analysis of non-response yielded significant differences. Private not-for-profit 4-year institutions were statistically more likely to respond to the survey and private 2-year institutions (both non-profit and for-profit) were less likely to respond. Additionally the sampling design yielded a higher probability of being selected in the sample for the not-for-profit 2-year institution category. Finally, the IPEDS generated surveys for institutions without undergraduates yielded a much higher response from that group than if the sample were random. Estimates from the sample therefore are biased if no adjustments are made to the dataset.

As a result of the missing data analysis two weights were computed. One weight adjusts for unit-nonresponse and differential sampling probabilities within the stratum and a second weight makes a post-stratification adjustment for the 100% response rate of institutions without undergraduate students. The calculations for the first weight (labeled wt2n) are displayed in Tables B5, B6, and B7. To correct for differential selection probabilities, all sectors were weighted upwards to be consistent with the number of title IV degree-granting institutions in the

Table B5: Strata weight adjustment calculations due to differential selection probability

Stratum	Population Size	Target Stratum Sample Size	Probability of Selection	Probability of Selection in Random Sample	Weight Adjustment due to Differential Selection Probability
	N_h		$P(s)$	$P(SSRS)$	$[P(s) / P(SSRS)] / P(SSRS) = w_2$
Public, 4-year	670	213	0.320	0.335	3.122
Private, not-for-profit, 4-year	1,575	504	0.320	0.335	3.125
For-Profit, 4-year	538	172	0.320	0.335	3.128
Public, 2-year	1,031	330	0.320	0.335	3.124
Private, not-for-profit, 2-year	98	98	1.000	0.335	1.000
For-Profit, 2-year	583	187	0.321	0.335	3.117
Total	4,495	1,504			

Table B6: Strata weight adjustment calculations due to unit non-response

Stratum	Population Size	Actual Sample Size by Stratum	Respondents	Response Rate	Weight Adjustment due to Non-Response
	N_h	n_h			w_3
Public, 4-year	670	213	92	0.432	2.315
Private, not-for-profit, 4-year	1,575	504	212	0.421	2.377
For-Profit, 4-year	538	172	54	0.314	3.185
Public, 2-year	1,031	330	109	0.330	3.028
Private, not-for-profit, 2-year	98	98	23	0.235	4.261
For-Profit, 2-year	583	187	10	0.053	18.700
Total	4,495	1,504	500	0.332	

Table B7: Final weights by stratum (wt2n)

Stratum	Weight Adjustment due to Differential Selection Probability	Weight Adjustment due to Non-Response	Final Weight (Not Normalized)
	w_2	w_3	$w_{final} = w_2 \times w_3$
Public, 4-year	3.122	2.315	7.228
Private, not-for-profit, 4-year	3.125	2.377	7.429
For-Profit, 4-year	3.128	3.185	9.962
Public, 2-year	3.124	3.028	9.458
Private, not-for-profit, 2-year	1.000	4.261	4.260
For-Profit, 2-year	3.117	18.700	58.294

IPEDS universe (Table B5). To correct for unit non-response, the for-profit, 2-year institutions were weighted up to their population level because the response rate within that stratum was much lower than the other sectors. The other sectors were weighted to the appropriate level for their respective population level within each stratum (Table B6). The final weight is computed by multiplying the two as shown in Table B7. Each case in the data set is assigned the appropriate weight value and all weights are normalized by dividing each weighted value by the mean so the statistical tests aren't biased as a result of the high number of institutions in the weighted data.

The calculations for the second weight (labeled wt4n) are displayed in Tables B8, B9, and B10. A post-stratification adjustment was required because the responses obtained for non-undergraduate institutions obtained using IPEDS data was not random and would provide significant response bias in the analysis. Three additional strata are added to the weighting tables reflecting the non-undergraduate institutions within each of the sectors. As shown in Table B8,

Table B8: Alternate strata weight adjustment calculations due to differential selection probability with post-stratification correction

Stratum	Population Size	Target Stratum Sample Size	Probability of Selection	Probability of Selection in Random Sample	Weight Adjustment due to Differential Selection Probability
	N_h		$P(s)$	$P(SSRS)$	$[P(s) / P(SSRS)] / P(SSRS) = w_2$
Undergraduate institutions					
Public, 4-year	654	208	0.318	0.335	3.144
Private, not-for-profit, 4-year	1,351	436	0.323	0.335	3.098
For-Profit, 4-year	512	161	0.314	0.335	3.180
Public, 2-year	1,031	330	0.320	0.335	3.124
Private, not-for-profit, 2-year	98	98	1.000	0.335	1.000
For-Profit, 2-year	583	187	0.321	0.335	3.117
Institutions with no undergraduates					
Public, 4-year	16	5	0.313	0.335	3.200
Private, not-for-profit, 4-year	224	68	0.304	0.335	3.294
For-Profit, 4-year	26	11	0.423	0.335	2.363
Total	4,495	1,504			

the calculations to adjust for differential selection probabilities are similar to those in the previous weight. When correcting for unit non-response, however, Table B9 does not weight non-undergraduate institutions and adjust other sectors upward depending on the response rate within each stratum. As displayed in Table B10, the final weight is computed by multiplying the two sub-weight components and is normalized in the final analytic dataset.

Table B11 displays the frequency percentages for institutional characteristics with and without the weights created for analysis. Whereas the unweighted analytical sample was not necessarily representative of the composition of the population with statistically significant differences by control, sector, tuition reporting method, and Carnegie classification, the weighted

Table B9: Alternate strata weight adjustment calculations due to unit non-response with post-stratification correction

Stratum	Population Size	Actual Sample Size by Stratum	Respondents	Response Rate	Weight Adjustment due to Non-Response
	N_h	n_h			W_3
Undergraduate institutions					
Public, 4-year	654	208	87	0.418	2.391
Private, not-for-profit, 4-year	1,351	436	144	0.330	3.028
For-Profit, 4-year	512	161	43	0.267	3.744
Public, 2-year	1,031	330	109	0.330	3.028
Private, not-for-profit, 2-year	98	98	23	0.235	4.261
For-Profit, 2-year	583	187	10	0.053	18.700
Institutions with no undergraduates					
Public, 4-year	16	5	5	1.000	1.000
Private, not-for-profit, 4-year	224	68	68	1.000	1.000
For-Profit, 4-year	26	11	11	1.000	1.000
Total	4,495	1,504	500	0.332	

Table B10: Final weights by stratum with post-stratification correction (wt4n)

Stratum	Weight Adjustment due to Differential Selection Probability	Weight Adjustment due to Non-Response	Final Weight (Not Normalized)
	W_2	W_3	$W_{final} = W_2 \times W_3$
Undergraduate institutions			
Public, 4-year	3.144	2.391	7.516
Private, not-for-profit, 4-year	3.098	3.028	9.381
For-Profit, 4-year	3.180	3.744	11.906
Public, 2-year	3.124	3.028	9.458
Private, not-for-profit, 2-year	1.000	4.261	4.260
For-Profit, 2-year	3.117	18.700	58.294
Institutions without undergraduates			
Public, 4-year	3.200	1.000	3.200
Private, not-for-profit, 4-year	3.294	1.000	3.294
For-Profit, 4-year	2.363	1.000	2.363

samples perform much better. The wt2n weight yielded no statistically significant differences and the wt4n weight yielded significant differences for Carnegie classification. The descriptive statistics for both weights were also comparable to the population. In this report, the wt2n weight is utilized for all analyses that exclude institutions without undergraduates and the wt4n weight is utilized for all analyses that include all institutions.

Table B11: Comparison of unweighted and weighted samples with population of degree-granting postsecondary education institutions: 2008 IPEDS Institutional Characteristics Survey

	Analytic Sample Percent (%) n=500	Population Percent (%) N=4,495	Analytic Sample (Weighted - wt2n) Percent (%) n=500	Analytic Sample (Weighted - wt4n) Percent (%) n=500
By Control				
Public	40.2	37.8	37.8	37.9
Private/Nonprofit	47.0 ***	37.2	37.3 (n.s.)	37.1 (n.s.)
Private/For profit	12.8	24.9	25.0	25.0
By Sector				
Public 4-year	18.4	14.9	14.8	14.9
Private/Nonprofit 4-year	42.4 ***	35.0	35.1 (n.s.)	35.0 (n.s.)
Private/For profit 4-year	10.8	12.0	12.0	12.0
Public 2-year	21.8	22.9	23.0	23.0
Private/Nonprofit 2-year	4.6 ***	2.2	2.2	2.2
Private/For profit 2-year	2.0	13.0	13.0	13.0
Less-than-2-year	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
By Tuition Reporting Method				
Academic year	99.0 ***	94.1	95.7 (n.s.)	95.8 *
Program	1.0	5.9	4.3	4.2
By Carnegie Classification				
Doctoral Research Universities	9.4 ***	5.8	7.7 (n.s.)	8.0 **
Masters Colleges & Universities	17.6 ***	13.3	14.4 (n.s.)	16.8 **
Baccalaureate Colleges	12.2	11.9	10.1	12.6
Baccalaureate/Associates Colleges	1.4	1.2	1.3	1.5
Associates Colleges	28.6	33.2	33.1	33.3
Other/Specialty Institutions	18.4	14.7	15.5	11.3
Unclassified	12.4	19.9	17.9	16.5
Geographic Region				
New England	5.0	5.9	4.4	4.0
Mid-Atlantic	15.6	15.9	13.2	12.6
Great Lakes	15.4	15.1	19.1	19.5
Plains	13.0	10.3	11.3	11.6
Southeast	23.6	24.6	25.5	26.4
Southwest	10.2	8.8	10.5	10.1
Rocky Mountains	2.8	3.7	2.8	2.9
Far West	12.4	13.6	11.4	10.9
US Territories	1.8	1.9	1.6	1.8
Average Published Tuition	\$11,933	\$11,538	\$11,400	\$12,111

Appendix C: Survey Questionnaire

The survey displayed in this appendix was administered in a web format using Survey Monkey (www.surveymonkey.com). The skip patterns in the survey were automated to reduce errors in entering data. Most institutions did not need to answer all the questions in the survey. Figure C1 displays the survey introduction screen, and the survey, instructions, and definitions follow.

Figure C1: Survey introduction screen

AIR/NCES Differential Tuition Survey

Welcome to the AIR/NCES Differential Tuition Survey website. Your institution was randomly selected from all Title IV degree-granting institutions to participate in this survey. You will be asked to provide follow-up information to the 2008 Integrated Postsecondary Education Data System (IPEDS) Institutional Characteristics (IC) Survey. The purpose of this data collection is to better understand the number of institutions that use differential pricing of tuition and fees for some programs and services. The information can be used to assess the accuracy of the tuition pricing information reported to IPEDS. Specifically, this survey requests information on differences in tuition and fee pricing by instructional program, student level, or type of program at your institution. The survey is divided into the following sections:

- Contact Information
- Composition of Charges
- Tuition Rates by Instructional Program
- Fee Rates by Instructional Program
- Other Student Charges

The survey is designed to be completed by IPEDS keyholders or other data reporting coordinators at the institution and is estimated to take from 10 to 25 minutes depending on the number of different pricing structures at your institution. The responses that you will provide on behalf of your institution will remain confidential. Although survey responses will be confidential in that any reports and publications will not identify an institution, aggregate data will be reported.

Although this survey is not mandatory or a part of the IPEDS data collection, your participation in this study is greatly appreciated. Respondents who complete the survey will receive a copy of the study's results. The results of a successful survey should provide institutions with information about differential tuition pricing practices at other institutions. If you have any questions regarding this study, please contact:

{Contact Information}

{"Start the Survey" hyperlink}

AIR/NCES Differential Tuition Survey

This survey is a follow-up to the IPEDS Institutional Characteristics survey. Please note that ALL questions in this survey request information from the 2008-2009 ACADEMIC YEAR (which is not the year you just reported on).

Before completing the survey, please note:

- TUITION does not include student fees unless specified in the question.
- For institutions that charge by a student's residence (e.g. public institutions and community colleges), unless it is stated differently in a question, please report the in-district or in-state published tuition rate (whichever is lower).
- For institutions with 4-year guaranteed tuition policies who are unable to answer a question, use the same calculation method you used for IPEDS to compute your tuition and fees.
- FEES do not include course-based fees. Reminders will be provided where appropriate.
- Hyperlinks in the questions link to a definitions page.

To complete this survey, you will need to refer to a complete 2008 tuition and fees schedule for your institution. It may be helpful to have this information readily available before completing the survey. If cookies are enabled on your computer, you can leave this survey and return to enter data at a later time if you do not have information readily available.

1. Does your institution charge different TUITION levels (excluding fees) depending on the attendance status of an undergraduate student (full-time or part-time)?

Response Options:

- Yes
- No

Given that some first-time full-time undergraduate students may enter with enough credits to be charged at a different tuition rate, what calculation best characterizes how you reported the 2008-2009 published academic year tuition to the IPEDS Institutional Characteristics (IC) Survey (e.g. Part D: Price of Attendance) for your institution?

Response Options:

- the lowest published tuition rate
- the highest published tuition rate
- the unweighted average published tuition rate
- the weighted average published tuition rate
- another method (please specify)

2. Does your institution charge different FEE levels depending on the attendance status of an undergraduate student (full-time or part-time)? Do not include course-based fees in answering this question.

Response Options:

- Yes
- No
- Not Applicable

4. Does your institution charge different FEE levels depending on the level of full-time undergraduate student (e.g. lower level, upper level, freshman, sophomore, junior, senior)? Do not include course-based fees in answering this question.

Response Options:

- Yes
- No
- Not Applicable

3. Does your institution charge different TUITION levels (excluding fees) depending on the level of full-time undergraduate student (e.g. lower level, upper level, freshman, sophomore, junior, senior)?

Response Options:

- Yes ► [GO TO QUESTION 3a ↴](#)
- No ► [SKIP TO QUESTION 4](#)

3a. According to the previous questions, your institution charges different tuition rates depending on an undergraduate student's level.

5. Does your institution charge different TUITION levels (excluding fees) depending on the level (undergraduate or graduate) of full-time student?

Response Options:

- Yes, graduate students are charged at a different tuition rate from undergraduate students.
- Yes, graduate students are typically charged at a different tuition rate from undergraduates, although for a few instructional programs undergraduates and graduates are charged the same tuition rate
- No, graduate students and undergraduate students are charged at the same tuition rate
- Not applicable (there are no graduate programs)

6. Does your institution charge different FEE levels depending on the level (undergraduate or graduate) of full-time student? Do not include course-based fees in answering this question.

Response Options:

- Yes, graduate students are charged at a different rate from undergraduate students.
- Yes, graduate students are typically charged at a different rate from undergraduates, although for a few instructional programs undergraduates and graduates are charged the same tuition rate
- No, graduate students and undergraduate students are charged at the same rate
- Not Applicable because there are no mandatory fees
- Not Applicable because there are no graduate programs

7. Characterize how your institution reports published TUITION levels to the Integrated Postsecondary Education Data System (IPEDS) (e.g. Part D: Price of Attendance in the Institutional Characteristics (IC) Survey) in relation to the TUITION charged at your institution:

Response Options:

- We report tuition by ACADEMIC YEAR, but SOME instructional programs have a different rate. ► **SKIP TO QUESTION 8**
- We report tuition by ACADEMIC YEAR because ALL instructional programs are charged at the same rate. ► **SKIP TO QUESTION 18**
- We report tuition by PROGRAM because most or all of our instructional programs have different rates. ► **GO TO QUESTION 7a**

7a. According to the previous question, your institution reported that it charged tuition by program to the IPEDS Institutional Characteristics Survey. Do you have a group of instructional programs that are charged identical full-time undergraduate TUITION AND FEE rates?

Response Options:

- Yes
- No

7b. How many instructional programs are charged identical tuition and fees rates?

Response Options:

- Open-ended number

7c. What are the tuition and fees rate for the identical tuition and fees rate that impacts the most full-time undergraduate students? For institutions that do not differentiate tuition by residence, enter the same value for in-district, in-state, and out-of-state.

Response Options:	Institution's Response Categories:
-------------------	------------------------------------

Open-ended number	In-District:
	In-State:
	Out-of-State:
	Length of Program (Months):
	Length of Program (Credits):
	Length of Program (Contact hrs):
	FT UG Students Impacted FA08:

► **PROGRAM REPORTERS SKIP TO QUESTION 18**

8. Does your institution charge a different first-year full-time undergraduate TUITION rate (excluding fees) than the published TUITION rates reported to the IPEDS Institutional Characteristics (IC) Survey for any instructional programs in BUSINESS (2-digit CIP: 52)?

Response Options:

- Yes ► **GO TO QUESTION 8a**
- No ► **SKIP TO QUESTION 9**
- Not Applicable ► **SKIP TO QUESTION 9**

8a. Please enter the 2008-2009 PUBLISHED TUITION amount (excluding fees) for first-year full-time undergraduates in the BUSINESS instructional program with the different TUITION rate (if multiple programs have different rates, report the program with the largest enrollment):

Response Options:

- Open-ended number

9. Does your institution charge a different first-year full-time undergraduate TUITION rate (excluding fees) than the published TUITION rates reported to the IPEDS Institutional Characteristics (IC) Survey for any instructional programs in ENGINEERING (2-digit CIP: 14)?

Response Options:

- Yes ► **GO TO QUESTION 9a ↓**
- No ► **SKIP TO QUESTION 10**
- Not Applicable ► **SKIP TO QUESTION 10**

9a. Please enter the 2008-2009 PUBLISHED TUITION amount (excluding fees) for first-year full-time undergraduates in the ENGINEERING instructional program with the different TUITION rate (if multiple programs have different rates, report the program with the largest enrollment):

Response Options:

- Open-ended number

10. Does your institution charge a different first-year full-time undergraduate TUITION rate (excluding fees) than the published TUITION rates reported to the IPEDS Institutional Characteristics (IC) Survey for any instructional programs in EDUCATION (2-digit CIP: 13)?

Response Options:

- Yes ► **GO TO QUESTION 10a ↓**
- No ► **SKIP TO QUESTION 11**
- Not Applicable ► **SKIP TO QUESTION 11**

10a. Please enter the 2008-2009 PUBLISHED TUITION amount (excluding fees) for first-year full-time undergraduates in the EDUCATION instructional program with the different TUITION rate (if multiple programs have different rates, report the program with the largest enrollment):

Response Options:

- Open-ended number

11. Does your institution charge a different first-year full-time undergraduate TUITION rate (excluding fees) than the published TUITION rates reported to the IPEDS Institutional Characteristics (IC) Survey for any instructional programs in HEALTH SCIENCES (2-digit CIP: 51)?

Response Options:

- Yes ► **GO TO QUESTION 11a ↓**
- No ► **SKIP TO QUESTION 12**
- Not Applicable ► **SKIP TO QUESTION 12**

11a. Please enter the 2008-2009 PUBLISHED TUITION amount (excluding fees) for first-year full-time undergraduates in the HEALTH SCIENCES instructional program with the different TUITION rate (if multiple programs have different rates, report the program with the largest enrollment):

Response Options:

- Open-ended number

12. Does your institution charge a different first-year full-time undergraduate TUITION rate (excluding fees) than the published TUITION rates reported to the IPEDS Institutional Characteristics (IC) Survey for any instructional programs in COMPUTER SCIENCE (2-digit CIP: 11)?

Response Options:

- Yes ► **GO TO QUESTION 12a ↓**
- No ► **SKIP TO QUESTION 13**
- Not Applicable ► **SKIP TO QUESTION 13**

12a. Please enter the 2008-2009 PUBLISHED TUITION amount (excluding fees) for first-year full-time undergraduates in the COMPUTER SCIENCE instructional program with the different TUITION rate (if multiple programs have different rates, report the program with the largest enrollment):

Response Options:

- Open-ended number

13. Does your institution charge a different first-year full-time undergraduate TUITION rate (excluding fees) than the published TUITION rates reported to the IPEDS Institutional Characteristics (IC) Survey for any instructional programs in JOURNALISM (2-digit CIP: 09)?

Response Options:

- Yes ► **GO TO QUESTION 13a ↓**
- No ► **SKIP TO QUESTION 14**
- Not Applicable ► **SKIP TO QUESTION 14**

13a. Please enter the 2008-2009 PUBLISHED TUITION amount (excluding fees) for first-year full-time undergraduates in the JOURNALISM instructional program with the different TUITION rate (if multiple programs have different rates, report the program with the largest enrollment):

Response Options:

- Open-ended number

14. Does your institution charge a different first-year full-time undergraduate TUITION rate (excluding fees) than the published TUITION rates reported to the IPEDS Institutional Characteristics (IC) Survey for any other instructional programs not mentioned in this survey?

Response Options:

- Yes ► **GO TO QUESTION 14a ↓**
- No ► **SKIP TO QUESTION 15**
- Not Applicable ► **SKIP TO QUESTION 15**

14a. Please select the OTHER instructional program area where your institution charges different TUITION levels:

Response Options:

- 2-digit program CIP Code

14b. Please enter the 2008-2009 PUBLISHED TUITION amount (excluding fees) for first-year full-time undergraduates in the OTHER instructional program with the different TUITION rate (if multiple programs have different rates, report the program with the largest enrollment):

Response Options:

- Open-ended number

15. This survey only requests information from the largest enrollments in six instructional programs at your institution. Overall, how many instructional programs at your institution are charged at a different full-time undergraduate TUITION AND FEE rate than the published rates reported in the IPEDS Institutional Characteristics Survey (Part D: Price of Attendance)?

Response Options:

- Open-ended number

16. Given that some instructional programs are charged at different TUITION AND FEE rates than was reported in Part D (Price of Attendance) of the IPEDS Institutional Characteristics Survey:

How many full-time undergraduate students at your institution were enrolled in these instructional programs in the Fall of 2008?

Response Options:

- Open-ended number

17. What calculation best characterizes how you reported the 2008-2009 published academic year tuition to the IPEDS Institutional Characteristics (IC) Survey (e.g. Part D: Price of Attendance) for your institution?

Response Options:

- the published tuition rate applicable to the majority of students
- the lowest published tuition rate
- the highest published tuition rate
- the unweighted average published tuition rate
- the weighted average published tuition rate
- another method (please specify)

18. Characterize how you report published FEE levels to the Integrated Postsecondary Education Data System (IPEDS) (e.g. Part D: Price of Attendance in the Institutional Characteristics Survey) in relation to the FEES charged at your institution (exclude course-based fees when answering this question):

Response Options:

- We report mandatory fees by ACADEMIC YEAR, but SOME instructional programs have a different rate. ► **GO TO QUESTION 19 ↓**
- We report mandatory fees by ACADEMIC YEAR because ALL instructional programs are charged at the same rate. ► **SKIP TO QUESTION 26**
- We report mandatory fees by PROGRAM because most or all of our instructional programs have different rates. ► **SKIP TO QUESTION 26**
- Not Applicable (institution has no mandatory fees). ► **SKIP TO QUESTION 26**

19. Does your institution charge a different first-year full-time undergraduate FEE rates than the published FEE rates reported to the IPEDS Institutional Characteristics (IC) Survey for any instructional programs in BUSINESS (2-digit CIP: 52)? Do not include course-based fees when answering this question.

Response Options:

- Yes ► **GO TO QUESTION 19a ↓**
- No ► **SKIP TO QUESTION 20**
- Not Applicable ► **SKIP TO QUESTION 20**

19a. Please enter the 2008-2009 FEE amount for first-year full-time undergraduates in the BUSINESS instructional program with the different TUITION rate (if multiple programs have different rates, report the program with the largest enrollment):

Response Options:

- Open-ended number

20. Does your institution charge a different first-year full-time undergraduate FEE rates than the published FEE rates reported to the IPEDS Institutional Characteristics (IC) Survey for any instructional programs in ENGINEERING (2-digit CIP: 14)? Do not include course-based fees when answering this question.

Response Options:

- Yes ► [GO TO QUESTION 20a 1](#)
- No ► [SKIP TO QUESTION 21](#)
- Not Applicable ► [SKIP TO QUESTION 21](#)

20a. Please enter the 2008-2009 FEE amount for first-year full-time undergraduates in the ENGINEERING instructional program with the different TUITION rate (if multiple programs have different rates, report the program with the largest enrollment):

Response Options:

- Open-ended number

21. Does your institution charge a different first-year full-time undergraduate FEE rates than the published FEE rates reported to the IPEDS Institutional Characteristics (IC) Survey for any instructional programs in EDUCATION (2-digit CIP: 13)? Do not include course-based fees when answering this question.

Response Options:

- Yes ► [GO TO QUESTION 21a 1](#)
- No ► [SKIP TO QUESTION 22](#)
- Not Applicable ► [SKIP TO QUESTION 22](#)

21a. Please enter the 2008-2009 FEE amount for first-year full-time undergraduates in the EDUCATION instructional program with the different TUITION rate (if multiple programs have different rates, report the program with the largest enrollment):

Response Options:

- Open-ended number

22. Does your institution charge a different first-year full-time undergraduate FEE rates than the published FEE rates reported to the IPEDS Institutional Characteristics (IC) Survey for any instructional programs in HEALTH SCIENCES (2-digit CIP: 51)? Do not include course-based fees when answering this question.

Response Options:

- Yes ► [GO TO QUESTION 22a 1](#)
- No ► [SKIP TO QUESTION 23](#)
- Not Applicable ► [SKIP TO QUESTION 23](#)

22a. Please enter the 2008-2009 FEE amount for first-year full-time undergraduates in the HEALTH SCIENCES instructional program with the different TUITION rate (if multiple programs have different rates, report the program with the largest enrollment):

Response Options:

- Open-ended number

23. Does your institution charge a different first-year full-time undergraduate FEE rates than the published FEE rates reported to the IPEDS Institutional Characteristics (IC) Survey for any instructional programs in COMPUTER SCIENCE (2-digit CIP: 11)? Do not include course-based fees when answering this question.

Response Options:

- Yes ► [GO TO QUESTION 23a 1](#)
- No ► [SKIP TO QUESTION 24](#)
- Not Applicable ► [SKIP TO QUESTION 24](#)

23a. Please enter the 2008-2009 FEE amount for first-year full-time undergraduates in the COMPUTER SCIENCE instructional program with the different TUITION rate (if multiple programs have different rates, report the program with the largest enrollment):

Response Options:

- Open-ended number

24. Does your institution charge a different first-year full-time undergraduate FEE rates than the published FEE rates reported to the IPEDS Institutional Characteristics (IC) Survey for any instructional programs in JOURNALISM (2-digit CIP: 09)? Do not include course-based fees when answering this question.

Response Options:

- Yes ► [GO TO QUESTION 24a 1](#)
- No ► [SKIP TO QUESTION 25](#)
- Not Applicable ► [SKIP TO QUESTION 25](#)

24a. Please enter the 2008-2009 FEE amount for first-year full-time undergraduates in the JOURNALISM instructional program with the different TUITION rate (if multiple programs have different rates, report the program with the largest enrollment):

Response Options:

- Open-ended number

25. Does your institution charge a different first-year full-time undergraduate FEE rates than the published FEE rates reported to the IPEDS Institutional Characteristics (IC) Survey for any other instructional programs not mentioned in this survey? Do not include course-based fees when answering this question.

Response Options:

- Yes ► **GO TO QUESTION 25a ↓**
- No ► **SKIP TO QUESTION 26**
- Not Applicable ► **SKIP TO QUESTION 26**

25a. Please select the OTHER instructional program area where your institution charges different TUITION levels:

Response Options:

- 2-digit program CIP Code

25b. Please enter the 2008-2009 FEE amount for first-year full-time undergraduates in the OTHER instructional program with the different TUITION rate (if multiple programs have different rates, report the program with the largest enrollment):

Response Options:

- Open-ended number

26. In comparison to most other programs at your institution, are the charges different if a full-time undergraduate is enrolled in any of the following programs? (Please select two responses, one for tuition and one for fees, in each row.)

Response Options:	TUITION (excluding fees)	MANDATORY FEES (excluding course-based fees)
Honors Program	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Yes, at a higher level - Yes, at a lower level - No - Not Applicable 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Yes, at a higher level - Yes, at a lower level - No - Not Applicable
Distance learning program (exclude individual courses; only include instructional <u>programs</u> designated by your institution as distance learning)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Yes, at a higher level - Yes, at a lower level - No - Not Applicable 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Yes, at a higher level - Yes, at a lower level - No - Not Applicable
Weekend Program	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Yes, at a higher level - Yes, at a lower level - No - Not Applicable 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Yes, at a higher level - Yes, at a lower level - No - Not Applicable
Evening Program	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Yes, at a higher level - Yes, at a lower level - No - Not Applicable 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Yes, at a higher level - Yes, at a lower level - No - Not Applicable

27. Does your institution charge different full-time undergraduate TUITION levels (excluding fees) depending on a student's current or past service in the armed forces (including the National Guard)?

Response Options:

- Yes, at a higher rate than most programs
- Yes, at a lower rate than most programs
- No, but the students are classified as in-state for the purposes of charging tuition
- No (and none of the above apply)

Guard)? Do not include course-based fees in answering this question.

Response Options:

- Yes, at a higher rate than most programs
- Yes, at a lower rate than most programs
- No, but the students are classified as in-state for the purposes of charging tuition
- No (and none of the above apply)

28. Does your institution charge different full-time undergraduate FEE levels depending on a student's current or past service in the armed forces (including the National

Thank you for your time. Your responses have been recorded and uploaded. Should you have any questions about this survey, please contact:

{Contact Information}

AIR/NCES Differential Tuition Survey

Definition of Terms

Academic year reporter - Institutions who reported published tuition and fee rates to the 2008 IPEDS Institutional Characteristics (IC) Survey using the "Academic Year" section of the survey. Institutions in this section of the IC survey report in-district, in-state, and out-of-state published tuition rates for the entire academic year. The majority of full-time undergraduate programs were charged at this published rate (excluding financial aid).

CIP code - A six-digit code in the form xx.xxxx that identifies instructional program specialties within educational institutions (See Classification of Instructional Programs (CIP)) (definition is identical to IPEDS).

Classification of Instructional Programs (CIP) - A taxonomic coding scheme for secondary and postsecondary instructional programs. It is intended to facilitate the organization, collection, and reporting of program data using classifications that capture the majority of reportable data. The CIP is the accepted federal government statistical standard on instructional program classifications and is used in a variety of education information surveys and databases (definition is identical to IPEDS).

Distance learning - An option for earning course credit at off-campus locations via cable television, internet, satellite classes, videotapes, correspondence courses, or other means (definition is identical to IPEDS).

Distance learning program - A program defined by an institution that predominately contains courses that utilize off-campus locations via cable television, internet, satellite classes, videotapes, correspondence courses, or other means for educating students remotely (see distance learning).

Fees - Fixed sum charges (in dollars) to students for items not covered by tuition and REQUIRED of such a large proportion of all students that the student who does not pay the charge is an exception. Exclude one-time admissions fees. Most questions in the survey exclude course-based fees (definition is similar to the IPEDS definition, but with modifications).

First-time student (undergraduate) - A student who has no prior postsecondary experience (except as noted below) attending any institution for the first time at the undergraduate level. This includes students enrolled in academic or occupational programs. It also includes students enrolled in the fall term who attended college for the first time in the prior summer term, and students who entered with advanced standing (college credits earned before graduation from high school) (definition is identical to IPEDS).

First-year student - A student who has completed less than the equivalent of 1 full year of undergraduate work; that is, less than 30 semester hours (in a 120-hour degree program) or less than 900 contact hours (definition is identical to IPEDS).

Full-time undergraduate student - A student enrolled for 12 or more semester credits, or 12 or more quarter credits, or 24 or more contact hours a week each term (definition is identical to IPEDS).

Graduate student - A student who holds a bachelor's or first-professional degree, or equivalent, and is taking courses at the post-baccalaureate level. These students may or may not be enrolled in graduate programs (definition is identical to IPEDS).

In-district student - A student who is a legal resident of the locality in which he/she attends school and thus is entitled to reduced tuition charges if offered by the institution (definition is identical to IPEDS).

In-district tuition - The tuition charged by the institution to those students residing in the locality in which they attend school. This may be a lower rate than in-state tuition if offered by the institution (definition is identical to IPEDS). If your institution charges tuition on a per-credit-hour basis, to report the in-district rate please estimate average tuition based on the average full-time credit hour load for an entire academic year.

In-state student - A student who is a legal resident of the state in which he/she attends school (definition is identical to IPEDS).

In-state tuition - The tuition charged by institutions to those students who meet the state's or institution's residency requirements (definition is identical to IPEDS). If your institution charges tuition on a per-credit-hour basis, please estimate average tuition based on the average full-time credit hour load for an entire academic year.

Integrated Postsecondary Education Data System (IPEDS) - The Integrated Postsecondary Education Data System (IPEDS), conducted by the NCES, began in 1986 and involves annual institution-level data collections. All postsecondary institutions that have a Program Participation Agreement with the Office of Postsecondary Education (OPE), U.S. Department of Education (throughout IPEDS referred to as "Title IV") are required to report data using a web-based data collection system. IPEDS currently consists of the following components: Institutional Characteristics (IC); 12-month Enrollment (E12); Completions (C);

Human Resources (HR) composed of Employees by Assigned Position (EAP), Fall Staff (S), and Salaries (SA); Fall Enrollment (EF); Graduation Rates (GRS); Finance (F); and Student Financial Aid (SFA) (definition is identical to IPEDS).

Institutional Characteristics (IC) - this annual component is the core of the IPEDS system and is required of all currently operating Title IV postsecondary institutions in the United States and other areas. As the control file for the entire IPEDS system, IC constitutes the sampling frame for all other NCES surveys of postsecondary institutions. It also helps determine the specific IPEDS screens that are shown to each institution. This component collects the basic institutional data that are necessary to sort and analyze not only the IC DATA, but also all other IPEDS DATAs. IC data are collected for the academic year, which generally extends from September of one calendar year to June of the following year. Specific data elements currently collected for each institution include: institution name, address, telephone number, control or affiliation, calendar system, levels of degrees and awards offered, types of programs, application information, student services, and accreditation. The IC component also collects pricing information including tuition and required fees, room and board charges, books and supplies and other expenses for release on College Navigator (definition is identical to IPEDS).

Out-of-state student - A student who is not a legal resident of the state in which he/she attends school (definition is identical to IPEDS).

Out-of-state tuition - The tuition charged by institutions to those students who do not meet the institution's or state's residency requirements (definition is identical to IPEDS). If your institution charges tuition on a per-credit-hour basis, to report the out-of-state rate please estimate average tuition based on the average full-time credit hour load for an entire academic year.

Part-time undergraduate student - A student enrolled for either less than 12 semester or quarter credits, or less than 24 contact hours a week each term (definition is identical to IPEDS).

Program reporter - Institutions who reported published tuition and fees rates to the 2008 IPEDS Institutional Characteristics Survey using the "Tuition by Program" section of the survey. Institutions in this section of the IC survey report the tuition and fees for the largest six programs at the institution.

Published tuition rate - The amount of money (in dollars) charged for instructional services (excluding fees and financial aid) to full-time undergraduate students for the FULL ACADEMIC YEAR. For institutions that charge by a student's residence (e.g. public institutions and community colleges), please report the in-district or in-state published tuition rate reported to IPEDS, unless specified differently in the question. If your institution charges tuition on a per-credit-hour basis, please estimate average tuition based on the average full-time credit hour load for an entire academic year (definition is similar to the IPEDS definition, but with modifications).

Standard course load - At some institutions, it is the range of the number of courses or credits defined by an institution that full-time students typically register for (e.g. 12-16 credits; 4-5 courses; etc.). At some institutions, full-time students that exceed the standard course load will be charged tuition at a different rate for the credits or courses beyond the standard course load.

Tuition - Unless specified in the question, "Tuition" refers to the published tuition rate defined above.

Undergraduate student - A student enrolled in a 4- or 5-year bachelor's degree program, an associate's degree program, or a vocational or technical program below the baccalaureate (definition is identical to IPEDS).

Appendix D: Communications with Respondents

Three sets of emails were sent to two sets of respondents. Institutional researchers and registrars received emails from Figures D1, D3, and D5. When data were unavailable for data reporting coordinators, chief executive officers received emails from Figures D2, D4, and D6. Emails were sent to potential respondents according to the following schedule:

- Email #1 - October 15, 2009 (Deadline for November 20, 2009)
- Email #2 - November 16, 2009 (Deadline for November 20, 2009)
- Email #3 - December 12, 2009 (Extended deadline for December 18, 2009)

Figure D1: Sample email #1 to data reporting coordinators

<p>SUBJECT: IPEDS Institutional Characteristics Follow-Up Survey</p> <p>Institutional Researcher/Registrar name Title Institution Name</p> <p>Dear {Name of Institutional Researcher/Registrar}:</p> <p>I am writing to request your assistance with a study sponsored by AIR and NCES. Your institution has been randomly selected to participate in a follow-up survey to better understand tuition pricing practices in postsecondary education. Your participation in this survey may assist in improving data collections through the Integrated Postsecondary Education Data System.</p> <p>If you choose to participate in this survey, all of your responses will be kept strictly confidential; your institution will not be identified at any time. Aggregate responses however will be made available to the public. The survey takes approximately 10 to 25 minutes to complete depending on the complexity of tuition pricing at your institution.</p> <p>Respondents who complete the survey will receive a copy of the study's results. The results of a successful survey should provide institutions with information about differential tuition pricing practices at other institutions.</p> <p>To participate in this study, click on the following URL:</p> <p>http://www.airweb.org/tuitionsurvey.html Your institution's Unit ID Number: <unitid></p> <p>If you are willing to participate in this study, please complete the survey by Friday, November 20, 2009. If you have questions about the survey, please contact Sean Simone, Research Fellow at (202) XXX-XXXX or at {email address}.</p> <p>Sincerely, Sean Simone</p>
--

Figure D2: Sample email #1 to chief executive officers

SUBJECT: IPEDS Institutional Characteristics Follow-Up Survey

Chief Executive Name
Chief Executive Title
Institution Name

Dear {Name of Chief Executive}:

I am writing to request your assistance with a study sponsored by the National Center for Education Statistics at the US Department of Education and the Association for Institutional Research. Your institution has been randomly selected to participate in a survey to better understand tuition pricing practices in postsecondary education. Although this data collection is not mandatory or part of the Integrated Postsecondary Education Data System (IPEDS) data collection, your institution's participation in this survey may assist in improving IPEDS. If you choose to participate in this survey please forward the instructions below to the IPEDS keyholder at your institution. Thank you for your time.

Sincerely,
Sean Simone
AIR/NCES Research Fellow

Dear IPEDs Keyholder/Data Reporting Coordinator:

I am writing to request your assistance with a study sponsored by AIR and NCES. Your institution has been randomly selected to participate in a follow-up survey to better understand tuition pricing practices in postsecondary education. Your participation in this survey may assist in improving data collections through the Integrated Postsecondary Education Data System.

If you choose to participate in this survey, all of your responses will be kept strictly confidential; your institution will not be identified at any time. Aggregate responses however will be made available to the public. The survey takes approximately **10 to 25 minutes** to complete depending on the complexity of tuition pricing at your institution.

Respondents who complete the survey will receive a copy of the study's results. The results of a successful survey should provide institutions with information about differential tuition pricing practices at other institutions.

To participate in this study, click on the following URL:

<http://www.airweb.org/tuitionsurvey.html>
Your institution's Unit ID Number: <unitid>

If you are willing to participate in this study, please complete the survey by Friday, November 20, 2009. If you have questions about the survey, please contact Sean Simone, Research Fellow at (202) XXX-XXXX or at {email address}.

Sincerely,
Sean Simone

Figure D3: Sample email #2 to data reporting coordinators

SUBJECT: IPEDS Institutional Characteristics Follow-Up Survey

Institutional Researcher/Registrar name

Title

Institution Name

Dear {Name of Institutional Researcher/Registrar}:

About a month ago, I wrote you to request your assistance with a study sponsored by AIR and NCES. As of the date of this email, I have not received a response from your institution. I wanted to send you a reminder that data collection for this study closes on **Friday, November 20th** and your participation will be greatly appreciated.

If you choose to participate in this survey, all of your responses will be kept strictly confidential; your institution will not be identified at any time. Aggregate responses however will be made available to the public. The survey takes approximately **10 to 25 minutes** to complete depending on the complexity of tuition pricing at your institution.

Respondents who complete the survey will receive a copy of the study's results. The results of a successful survey should provide institutions with information about differential tuition pricing practices at other institutions. Additionally, your participation in this survey may assist in improving data collections through the Integrated Postsecondary Education Data System.

To participate in this study, click on the following URL:

<http://www.airweb.org/tuitionsurvey.html>

Your institution's Unit ID Number: <unitid>

If you have questions about the survey, please contact Sean Simone, Postdoctoral Policy Research Fellow at (202) XXX-XXXX or at {email address}.

Sincerely,
Sean Simone

Figure D4: Sample email #2 to chief executive officers

SUBJECT: IPEDS Institutional Characteristics Follow-Up Survey

Chief Executive Name
Chief Executive Title
Institution Name

Dear {Name of Chief Executive}:

About a month ago, I wrote you to request your assistance with a study sponsored by the National Center for Education Statistics at the U.S. Department of Education and the Association for Institutional Research. If your institution has already submitted a response to the survey, I thank you and you can ignore this email. If not, I wanted to send a friendly reminder that the data collection is scheduled to close on Friday, November 20th.

Although this data collection is not mandatory or part of the Integrated Postsecondary Education Data System (IPEDS) data collection, your institution's participation in this survey may assist in improving IPEDS. If you choose to participate in this survey please forward the instructions below to the IPEDS keyholder at your institution. Thank you for your time.

Sincerely,
Sean Simone
AIR/NCES Research Fellow

Dear IPEDs Keyholder/Data Reporting Coordinator:

I am writing to request your assistance with a study sponsored by AIR and NCES. Your institution has been randomly selected to participate in a follow-up survey to better understand tuition pricing practices in postsecondary education. Your participation in this survey may assist in improving data collections through the Integrated Postsecondary Education Data System.

If you choose to participate in this survey, all of your responses will be kept strictly confidential; your institution will not be identified at any time. Aggregate responses however will be made available to the public. The survey takes approximately **10 to 25 minutes** to complete depending on the complexity of tuition pricing at your institution.

Respondents who complete the survey will receive a copy of the study's results. The results of a successful survey should provide institutions with information about differential tuition pricing practices at other institutions.

To participate in this study, click on the following URL:

<http://www.airweb.org/tuitionsurvey.html>
Your institution's Unit ID Number: <unitid>

If you are willing to participate in this study, please complete the survey by Friday, November 20, 2009. If you have questions about the survey, please contact Sean Simone, Postdoctoral Policy Research Fellow at (202) XXX-XXXX or at {email address}.

Sincerely,
Sean Simone

Figure D5: Sample email #3 to data reporting coordinators

SUBJECT: IPEDS Institutional Characteristics Follow-Up Survey

Institutional Researcher/Registrar name

Title

Institution Name

Dear {Name of Institutional Researcher/Registrar}:

I am writing to inform you that the deadline to complete the IPEDS Institutional Characteristics Tuition survey sponsored by AIR and NCES has been extended. If your institution has already submitted a response to the survey, I thank you and you can ignore this email. If not, I wanted to send a friendly reminder to complete the survey. While the survey is not a mandatory part of the IPEDS data collection process, your participation in the survey would be greatly helpful to the higher education community and your response would be appreciated. To increase response rates, the deadline to complete the survey has been **EXTENDED** until **Friday, December 18, 2009**.

If you choose to participate in this survey, all of your responses will be kept strictly confidential; your institution will not be identified at any time. Aggregate responses however will be made available to the public. The survey takes approximately **10 to 25 minutes** to complete depending on the complexity of tuition pricing at your institution.

Respondents who complete the survey will receive a copy of the study's results. The results of a successful survey should provide institutions with information about differential tuition pricing practices at other institutions. Additionally, your participation in this survey may assist in improving data collections through the Integrated Postsecondary Education Data System.

To participate in this study, click on the following URL:

<http://www.airweb.org/tuitionsurvey.html>

Your institution's Unit ID Number: <unitid>

If you have questions about the survey, please contact Sean Simone, Postdoctoral Policy Research Fellow at (202) XXX-XXXX or at {email address}.

Sincerely,
Sean Simone

Figure D6: Sample email #3 to chief executive officers

SUBJECT: IPEDS Institutional Characteristics Follow-Up Survey

Chief Executive Name
Chief Executive Title
Institution Name

Dear {Name of Chief Executive}:

In November, I wrote you to request your assistance with a study sponsored by the National Center for Education Statistics at the U.S. Department of Education and the Association for Institutional Research. If your institution has already submitted a response to the survey, I thank you and you can ignore this email. If not, I wanted to send a friendly reminder to respond to the survey. In order to increase response rates, the deadline to complete the survey has been EXTENDED until **Friday, December 18th**.

Although this data collection is not mandatory or part of the Integrated Postsecondary Education Data System (IPEDS) data collection, your institution's participation in this survey may assist in improving IPEDS. If you choose to participate in this survey please forward the instructions below to the IPEDS keyholder at your institution. Thank you for your time.

Sincerely,
Sean Simone
AIR/NCES Research Fellow

Dear IPEDs Keyholder/Data Reporting Coordinator:

I am writing to inform you that the deadline to complete the IPEDS Institutional Characteristics Tuition survey sponsored by AIR and NCES has been extended. If your institution has already submitted a response to the survey, I thank you and you can ignore this email. If not, I wanted to send a friendly reminder to complete the survey. While the survey is not a mandatory part of the IPEDS data collection process, your participation in the survey would be greatly helpful to the higher education community and your response would be greatly appreciated. To increase response rates, the deadline to complete the survey has been EXTENDED until Friday, **December 18, 2009**.

If you choose to participate in this survey, all of your responses will be kept strictly confidential; your institution will not be identified at any time. Aggregate responses however will be made available to the public. The survey takes approximately **10 to 25 minutes** to complete depending on the complexity of tuition pricing at your institution.

Respondents who complete the survey will receive a copy of the study's results. The results of a successful survey should provide institutions with information about differential tuition pricing practices at other institutions. Additionally, your participation in this survey may assist in improving data collections through the Integrated Postsecondary Education Data System.

To participate in this study, click on the following URL:

<http://www.airweb.org/tuitionsurvey.html>
Your institution's Unit ID Number: <unitid>

If you have questions about the survey, please contact Sean Simone, Postdoctoral Policy Research Fellow at (202) XXX-XXXX or at {email address}.

Sincerely,
Sean Simone

References

- Archibald, R. B., & Feldman, D. H. (2008). Explaining increases in higher education costs. *The Journal of Higher Education*, 79(3), 268-295.
- Carbone, R. F., & Jenson, O. (1971). *Non-Resident Students at State Universities and Land-Grant Colleges*. Washington, DC: Education Resources Information Center. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED052716)
- Epple, D., Romano, R., & Sieg, H. (2006). Admission, tuition, and financial aid policies in the market for higher education. *Econometrica*, 74(4), 885-928.
- Groves, R. M., Fowler, F. J., Couper, M. P., Lepkowski, J. M., Singer, E., & Tourangeau, R. (2004). *Survey Methodology*. Hoboken, NJ: John Wiley & Sons.
- Heller, D. E. (2006). State support of higher education: Past, present, and future. In D. M. Priest & E. P. St. John (Eds.) *Privatization and public universities* (pp. 11-37). Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Press.
- Hoxby, C. M. (1997). How the changing market structure of higher education explains college tuition. National Bureau of Economic Research, Working Paper #6323, <http://www.nber.org/papers/w6323>.
- Massy, W. F., & Zemsky, R. (1994). Faculty discretionary time: Departments and the "academic ratchet". *The Journal of Higher Education*, 65(1), 1-22.
- Massy, W. F., & Zemsky, R. (1997). A utility model for teaching load decisions in academic departments. *Economics of Education Review*, 16(4), 349-365.
- Mortenson, T. (2004). *Postsecondary Education OPPORTUNITY*. (No. 139). Oskaloosa, IA: Mortenson Research Seminar on Public Policy Analysis of Opportunity for Postsecondary Education.
- National Center for Education Statistics. (2007). *Integrated Postsecondary Education Data System*. Web site: URL <http://nces.ed.gov/ipeds>
- Nelson, G. R. (2008). *Differential tuition by undergraduate major: Its use, amount, and impact at public research universities*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Nebraska - Lincoln, Lincoln, NE.
- Saupe, J. L., & Stephens, W. (1974). *Differential by Level and Per Credit Student Charges in*

- Major Public Universities*. Washington, DC: Education Resources Information Center.
(ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED131739)
- Ward, D., & Douglass, J. A. (2005). The dynamics of variable fees: Exploring institutional and public policy responses. *Research and Occasional Paper Series (CSHE.5.05)*. University of California, Berkeley.
- Winston, G. C. (1999a). Subsidies, hierarchy, and peers: The awkward economics of higher education. *The Journal of Economic Perspectives*, 13(1), 13-36.
- Winston, G. C. (1999b). For-profit higher education: Godzilla or chicken little? *Change*, 31(1), 12-19.
- Yanikoski, R. A., & Wilson, R. F. (1984). Differential pricing of undergraduate education. *Journal of Higher Education* , 55(6), 735-750.
- Zemsky, R., Wegner, G. R., & Massy, W. F. (2005). *Remaking the American university: Market-smart and mission-centered*. New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press.